573
20

A VINDICATION OF THE Unitarians,

Against a Late

Reverend Author ON THE TRINITY.

In a LETTER.

Magna est veritas & prevalebit.

The Second Edition, Corrected and Enlarged.

William Fuller supposed author

LONDON:
Printed in the Year MDC XC.

UMI

One and Only, Infinite, Eternal, Almighty, and All-wiſe GOD, *Creator of Heaven and Earth.*

Dread FATHER,

FOR ſo Thou art pleas'd to let thy Creatures, miſerable Duſt and Aſhes, approach unto Thee, I the meaneſt of Thy Servants, who dare not preſume to call myſelf Thy Son, humbly, and with all ſubmiſſion offer myſelf, through Thine Only Begotten, to the Throne of Thy Grace, begging Thee for Chriſt's Sake to accept me, and not to deal with me in the Rigour of Thy Juſtice, but with tender Mercies, not as I deſerve, for Thou knoweſt me to have been a wretched Sinner, but as Thine own Goodneſs, and Loving kindneſs ſhall direct Thee.

Great God, I am throughly ſenſible, that all Things, all Power, all Wiſdom, and all Excellency, both in Heaven and Earth proceed from Thee, that we are not only ungrateful, but unjuſt, when we arrogate any thing to our ſelves, and do not render Thee the Glory! What are we but empty Bubbles, as Clay in the Hand of the Potter, who have not Wiſdom, no nor Being, without thy Bounty?

'Tis only Thou, through Thy Grace, that canſt make us either Veſſels of Honour or Diſhonour; who of us can add a Cubit to our Stature? who can change the colour of his Hair, or alter the figure of his Body? Did any of us contrive our own Beings? or

was it by our own Counſels we received Life, and were clothed with Fleſh?

In a thankful Acknowledgment therefore, and with a due and humble ſenſe of this, O Lord, I conſecrate this Book to Thee, pardon in it, I beſeech Thee, what Thou knoweſt Erroneous, and grant that what is agreeable to Thy Truth in it, may become firm and ſtrong, to the Advancement of thy Honour and Glory, and our Peace, Union, and Welfare.

I ſeek no Earthly Patron, I am ſure they can aſſiſt me but little; my whole Truſt and Confidence is in Thee therefore, who alone art truly Powerful: I know what thou willeſt, no Creature can or dare withſtand. And this I am further ſure, that no one that heartily approaches unto Thee, can ever be rejected, or ever confounded; nor can any Cauſe be too ſingular, if juſt, for thy Patronage.

Accept therefore theſe mine Endeavours, I beſeech Thee, and protect them by Thy gracious Favour: Open the Eyes of mine Adverſaries, and forgive them their Errors; let them ſee, O God, that 'tis not me they reſiſt, but Thee and Thy holy Laws. Am I able to Innovate upon, or Elude Thy Sacred Truths? Can I be preſum'd capable, by Art and Fallacies, to confound the Wiſdom of ſo Seeing an Age?

No ſurely, Men have corruptly ſtifled Thy Truths, which thô they fall into the hands of me, the meaneſt

of

of Thy Servants, yet are too bright to be Eclipſed by the Clouds of their Errors, and that it is that aggrieves them at what I write; but, O God, is it at me they are offended? ſurely it is at Thy Truths that croſs them: Alas, they do not ſee that they lift up their Hand againſt Heaven, and againſt Thee.

Is their Anger againſt me, O God! Thou knoweſt my Heart, I write not a word that I would not Recant the next Moment, could I be ſatisfied it were againſt Thy Truth. What do I Err, and cannot be confuted? at leaſt then Thou requireſt that they ſhould give me liberty, and bear with me; but I am afraid I err not; I am afraid I too juſtly Accuſe them of an Error that they ought to Reform, and will not.

If any thing I have wilfully and knowingly deviated from Thy Sacred Truths, let me be ſo far from Thy Favour, that let what I have wrote periſh before Thee; nay, if I have wilfully allow'd and continu'd my ſelf in ſuch Error, let my Soul periſh eternally for a Deceiver; let me neither have Happineſs here or hereafter: But if what I write be Truth, let it ſink into the very Souls of my Readers; let it be as Seed ſown to Everlaſting Life, and let it even confound all Gainſayers.

Nor do I apply my ſelf thus to Thee in Vanity and Pride, to Thee that art the Judge of all Fleſh, and ſeeſt as in a Glaſs my Secrets and Thoughts, ſurely no one dares be ſo uncharitable, whilſt I ſtand thus in thy Preſence,

ſence to think ſo, if not, let bruit Beaſts, Men drown'd in their Luſts, and that rail at what they underſtand not, be ſilent, let thoſe that would correct me be modeſt, and let no one dare malitiouſly to traduce theſe Truths which with all ſincerity, and the greateſt labours are Dedicated to Thine Honour, and the uniting of Thy confounded and diſtracted Churches.

But O Lord, without Thy Bleſſing and Aſſiſtance all our Labours are in vain, our Words vaniſh into Wind, and our Advice is as Madneſs, proſper therefore, I beſeech Thee, what I write, if it be according to Thy Will, let my Words like a two-edged Sword pierce Men to their Hearts, let it even cut off their Luſts, their Perverſeneſs, and their Prejudices from them, and do Thou now at their very Entrance, by a ſacred awe, even ſtem the Tide of their malicious and wicked Thoughts, and turn them into the purer Channel of Truth, Unity, and Purity.

How long, O Lord, wilt Thou hide Thy Face from us; Wilt Thou never avert Thy Judgments? Surely Thy Mercy will appear at laſt; Wilt Thou never caſt out the uncharitable Spirit of Error and Confuſion from among us? Art not Thou our Father, and we Thy Children? Is it poſſible Thou canſt forget us always? If our Prayers and Tears, and our weak Faith cannot prevail with Thee, ſurely Thy wonted Goodneſs can? O God make no long tarrying, but let us ſee that the Light of thy Countenance is at laſt among us!

The

ADVICE
TO THE
READER:
OR,
The DOCTOR's Damnatory Sentence
ANSWER'D.

1. THô we are not bound to ſearch all Truths, yet Truths of moment we are; he that ſearches not, ſins by wilful ignorance; and he that Cenſures without ſearching, is guilty of the greateſt Injuſtice.

2. Are we to anſwer for every idle word, much more for every good Inſtruction that we might have had, had we not neglected it. Remember what Chriſt ſaid, *He that is not for us is againſt us.*

3. Nor is it enough to be ruled by Learned Men, or the Church, but every Man is to anſwer to God for and by himſelf. Has he but little, God will require but little, provided he bury not his Talent.

4. That a Doctrine is ſingular, or has an ill name, and is called an Hereſie, is not enough for us to condemn it, for even Chriſtianity it ſelf had ſo once. Our duty is to ſearch all things, and hold faſt that which is beſt.

5. The

5. The greateſt Truth may be obſcured, and the Carcaſs of Error may look bright for a time through the Verniſh of Sophiſtry; but only Truth ſtands the refining, and ſhines the brighter through Contention.

6. That a Book does not convince, and is reputed inſufficient, is not alway ſo much that it wants a due force and truth, but that the Reader is prejudic'd, or has not the Courage to conſider.

7. Whoever ſuppreſſes a good Book, is guilty not only of his own wilful Ignorance, but even of the Ignorance of the People, and at laſt he will Anſwer for it, as well as *Ezekiel*'s Watchmen.

8. Even Authority and Command cannot juſtifie the ſtifling a good Book; we ought to Martyr for Truth, much more rather leave a Temporal Office, than ſtifle it.

9. Nor is it enough for a Magiſtrate, or Officer, by hearſay to know that a Book is ill; for if it be of a Subject of Conſequence, he is bound to examine it himſelf, before he condemn it: For know

10. Whatever ſin thou committeſt after wilful Ignorance, becomes wilful Guilt; and whilſt thou continueſt in it, thou art out of all poſſibility, much leſs hope of Salvation.

11. Whilſt thou art thus ſtubbornly wilfully Ignorant, none but a Popiſh Confeſſor can forgive thee in this World, nor will God in the next; and even thy Devotions, thy Prayers and Sacraments, will become a ſin to thee.

12. Indeed a wilful Ignorance forgot, may be forgiven through an unfeigned Repentance, in the crowd of unknown ſins; but art thou ſure that God will let thee forget this, when thou ſtifleſt maliciouſly a Truth ſo highly to his Honour, and ſo much for the Good of Mankind.

But above all remember, maliciouſly and contemptuouſly, whether for Intereſt, or otherwiſe, to blaſpheme theſe Truths that thy Conſcience convinces thee of, is never to be forgiven, nor never to be repented of.

At thy Peril Friend, and as thou'lt anſwer for it to God, apply this to thy ſelf.

Beware, or thou wilt find theſe terrible Truths at another Day.

Remember, He that breaks the leaſt Commandment, is Guilty of the whole Law.

THE

THE LETTER.

SIR,

I Dare not call you Adverſary, indeed, I rather believe we may be Friends; for tho' there may be a miſtake between us, yet I hope we both agree in a ſincere love, and ſearch for Truth; and in what we differ therefore, I ſhall rather ſeek to melt you with gentleneſs, than to ſubdue you with oppoſition.

Page 150, you tell us, *When we are ready, you hope to hear from us again:* and you ſee you have your deſire; you ſeem to have a ſincere good will to Truth your ſelf, and therefore you will be the leſs ſurpriz'd to ſee it in others; for when you have given ſo *bold* a Challenge to all Unitarians, you muſt expect, that we have but little reſpect for the Honour and Glory of God, if we do not anſwer you.

'Tis true, I come to *diſpute* you, and am no *Socinian*, and as an *Arrian* my Hypotheſis diſtorts your Argument a little; but as we are both joyn'd in one Common Cauſe, and you *attempt to deface* the Truth of both, ſo you muſt think, we expect you provide your ſelf to give us both ſatisfaction, for tho' you conquer either of us, your Work's but half done.

You muſt excuſe me therefore, if I mind not your *Socinian* Quarrels, but leaving them to themſelves, divert your Argument a little, and bring in a third Hypotheſis; you ſhall ſee I will deal fairly with you, ſtate the Matter truly, and proceed ſincerely, and clearly; whether you ſhall think your ſelf obliged to Reply to me, or not, upon it, is not my care; if I can but reſcue the Honour of God, and his Unity by it, I am ſatisfied.

To proceed therefore: It cannot be expected but that I have alter'd your Method; but yet you ſhall ſee withal, that I have juſtly collected all your ſcattered Reaſons together, and dealt faithfully with you; and tho' the change of the Hypotheſis neceſſitated this, yet in lieu of it, I ſhall preſent you with a Method both ſhorter and clearer, to recompence it.

'Tis plain, large Volumes deſtroy the Edge of Reaſoning, and the Vigour of Sence is loſt in the multitude of Words; I have choſen therefore, rather to be ſhort and ſinewy, than tedious and looſe, if the Foundation-Reaſoning be bad, Corollaries fall of courſe; and therefore my chief care has been, whether your leading and ground-work Principles be ſtrong, and to the purpoſe, or not.

I thank God, I do not see my Cause so weak, as to fly to Colours, or that I should use undue Arts for a shelter; and therefore if I have omitted any thing material, I protest before the *Almighty*, it has not been wilful; and if I have any where reprov'd you, as *God is my witness*, 'tbas been where Truth has necessitated and forc'd me; and if I have wrong'd you, I as heartily beg your Pardon.

In short, I have endeavour'd with the most serious Respect, and the greatest Christian Charity and Meekness, to shew you where you have err'd: Indeed, I have not spar'd to advise and reprove you where I ought; but if I have run that liberty into an extream, or been faulty in any thing, 'tbas been my frailty, and not my guilt.

All that I know therefore farther to add in this place, is, That perhaps you may wonder how I came to answer you so soon; but not to offend you, Sir, the Reason is obvious, though Fallacies are difficult, and to be studied, yet Truth is natural, and they are easily answer'd.

But before I proceed further, I see a necessity, Sir, to advise you of two Faults, Boasting and Uncharitableness; not that I can blame you over-much neither, nor may be acquit myself of their guilts, but I see a necessity to level these two Mountains in you, least by the Ignorant, these Fortresses of Imagination may be taken for those of Reality.

First for Boasting: In your Preface, Sir, you say, *You have said too much for us to answer*: And it may be so; but if you have not, we shall seek for Truth, and not to compare our selves with you. So *p.* 69, you call *our Reason Carnal*: And *pag.* 73, you tell us, We *puzzle and confound our selves with gross and corporeal Idea's of Essence and Substance*: when indeed, if such upbraiding Expressions were allowable, we might more justly reflect them upon the Eternal Generation you pretend to.

So you conclude your Book, *pag.* 271: you say, *It looks like a Judgment upon us, that while we talk of nothing less than the severest Reason, we impose upon our selves, or hope to impose upon the World, by the most childish Sophistry and Nonsence*; and so *pag.* 272, your last words are, You *will not envy us the Satisfaction of such Harangues, they being*, you say, *all the Comfort we have; but you are pretty confident we shall never be able to reason to any purpose in this Cause again.* And what, Sir, is not this Insolence?

Pray, Sir, what is it you mean by these Triumphs? Is it that you think to storm and brave us out of our Cause? or that you are sure you only are in the right? or that if you had the worst Cause, you could defend it well? Sir, my Charity shall speak the best for you, that you are sure you only are in the right; But if you are, has not Modesty more Charms to recommend you by, than Insolence——

Excuse me, Sir, I dislike not your Zeal in your Preface, to stick to your Faith, I rather wish it more common; for were it, Truth had scarce been such a Stranger among us; nor do I question your Ingenuity, and in Charity I hope you are sincere too; but these are Expressions that your Zeal has beguil'd you to, that want a Christian Modesty, and tho' such a Confidence, with a little more Humanity, might become an Apostle, yet how well they do a meaner Christian, I leave to your self to judge, in cooler thoughts.

The second thing I have to charge you with, is Uncharitableness, that because we differ in Judgment from you, in this Speculation, you not only treat us like Dogs, and deny us all hopes of Salvation, but withal you manage your Arguments for Truth,

Truth accordingly, and give us not so much as free Reasoning.

Thus you not only abound with Reflections on us, as in your Preface you say of us, We *are eminent for nothing but Blasphemy and Nonsense*: And *pag.* 9. you reflect, *It becomes the Wit and Understanding of an Heretick*: But *page* 24. you write more freely of us, and tells us, You *hope the Disputes of Hereticks against the Catholick Faith, shall not be called Controversies in the Churches of God.*

Now, if thus in the very beginning of your Book, you shew we ought to be condemn'd before we are heard, to what purpose does your Infallibility hold a Controversie with us; but I hope this is before you are aware; indeed in a Papist these Expressions might be natural enough, but Protestants methinks should be more ingenious, than to take Errours and Heresies for granted.

Consider, Sir, Churches have err'd, and may err, yea, in Matters of Faith too; if so, who is to be blam'd, he that by Reason seeks for Liberty, or he that unjustly with-holds it thrô Imposition? Did we seek to impose our Hypothesis's on the World, we were as much to be blam'd as you; but if we only set up ours, to confute the Uncharitableness of yours, wherein do we trespass?

You say, we are Hereticks, and have no Understanding: And whence come you to judge thus freely of us, and not we of you: So you say, we blaspheme, but pray is not your Charge precarious, and if retorted, falls it not as heavy on your self? If *we err*, indeed, we blaspheme the Son, and Holy Ghost; which we hope we do not; but if you err, do not you both blaspheme and commit Idolatry, in worshipping them as coequal to the Father?

But, Sir, we desire to have a Charity for your Misconstructions, and will give it you where possible, if so, pray at least return our love, you see we stoop to make the first offer; charge us not therefore, that we are only eminent for Blasphemy and Nonsense, for surely you may add in the other Scale, that we have a courageable good will to Truth, are some of us perverse, or do some of us revile; and what, are such Men wanting quite on your side?

If therefore you leave us but room to advise you, as much as the great *Moses* left *Jethro*, let us beg you for Christ's sake to cut off all these Offences; remember 'tis not Generous, much less Christianly, to discountenance a weaker Brother: But what? you believe not me; yet at least believe my Truths; for surely Christ's own Argument will hold you.

Can you expect Peace in Christ's Church, whilst you thus allarum and startle mens Consciences, by so great and grievous Impositions; Or what, do you expect Men should have no Conscience or Resentment for Truth? If you do not, do not fetter them thus; you know 'tis no Argument of Errour to be singular; nay, I am sure, you know very well, that Truth is rarely popular, but rather suppressed and stifled through Mens Lusts.

Let us learn therefore in this, to let Natural Religion lead our Revelation, else the Curse of the Holy Ghost will fall upon us, and thô we have eyes we shall not be able to see, nor were we Turks should we be capable of being converted; indeed, when we are bewitch'd to the fury of a prepossess'd Zeal, will not all Men say, we rather baffle, than love, or search for Truth when we argue?

Excuse me, Sir, that I am thus free with you, which I should not have been, had it not been in Justice to my Cause; but I durst not let these prepossessions ensnare my Reader, and yet not that I think so

heinously of you for them neither, for many that have wrote much worse than your self on the Subject, have been more *confident*; and I could with my self, as well as you, out of harms way of Errour; indeed, could I have had a fair Hearing without, I had been very easily otherwise satisfied.

PRECOGNITA.

I shall now only present you with a few Precognita, to state duly the true Idea of the Controversie, between the *Trinitarians*, and the *Arrians*, and I shall then proceed to a particular Answer; and I hope you shall see too, to your satisfaction, and without the least needless Cavil or Objection whatever.

The Trinitarian *believes.*

That there is one God, but that he Exists in Three Persons, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and that these Three Persons are co-equal, and co-eternal, and by a Joynt Power created the Heavens and Earth, Men and Angels, and all things else, that any way exist.

They believe, this Trin-unity even now continues to Rule the World by a Joynt Providence; but that for Orders sake, they have distributed their Dominions into several, and subordinate Personal Offices; thus they make the Father alone to personate the true God, the Son to become Incarnate, to redeem us to his Mercy, and the Holy Ghost under the Son, to assist us through Grace in his Trials.

The *Arrian* believes,

That there is but One God, and that he Exists but in One Person; that the Son and Holy Ghost are neither co-equal, nor co-eternal with him; that he first made the Son, and through him fram'd the Holy Ghost and Angels; that some of the Angels falling with Lucifer, *He through the Son, and by the Holy Ghost fram'd this World, and Man within it.*

They believe there is no co-equal Trinity to Rule the World through a Joynt Providence; but that their Dominions are subordinate, and adequate to their Powers; thus that the Father alone is the True God, that the Son became Incarnate *to* satisfie God's Justice, *to redeem his Creation, and to destroy the Devils Malice in* Adam, *and that the Son has deputed the Holy Ghost, to assist us through his Grace in our Trials.*

By this, Sir, I hope I have given you a fair Breviate of the two Hypothesis's, I shall only beg your Patience, whilst I add two or three Principles to illustrate the Controversie, and then after a few Reflections on them, I shall desist my Precognita, and proceed.

1. Nothing is more manifest, than that the Jews in the Idea of their First Commandment, conceiv'd but One Person to be in their One God, and that their Additions of more Persons would be the breach of it; and what then shall we be afraid for fear of a Mystery to own and reason about the Unity of God in his first Commandment, that we are thereby enjoyn'd to defend?

2. Could the Jews, or *Judas* have charg'd Christ, with pretending himself to be

be the Supream God, which the Gospel tells us the False Witnesses principally labour'd after, they would not only have made their Acclamation, *We have no King but* Cæsar; and their Inscription on his Cross, *Jesus of* Nazereth *the King of the Jews*, John 19. but they would have added, No God, no false God, too.

3. Lastly, 'Twas near 300 Years after Christ, e're Tradition and Scripture Interpretation were so much as urg'd to explain and bring forth a Trinity; so that we have not only the first Commandment corroborated by two Revelations of our sides, but we have even Tradition also as long as it was good and clear enough to be believ'd.

My Reflections upon these Principles, shall be only Two, and they are as follows:

First, That the Doctrine of the Trinity has alter'd the first and greatest Commandment, as it were, by chance; that is, by a blind Inference and a collective Interpretation, rather than expres Revelation. And whereas the Goodness of God in such a Case, would certainly allow us a solemn Repeal of his Commandment, the *Athanasian* Creed is so far from such Mercy, that it makes this very catch pœnal of Salvation; and that very Trinity, that without doubt received their Honour joyntly before, can now be admitted on no pretence, to receive it otherwise than severally.

Secondly, You see hereby, this Great Mystery is not purposely requir'd, but accidentally enforc'd; so that whether this inscrutable Mystery, and incomprehensible Hypothesis, be a Divine Truth or not, yet at least this is plain, the means of knowing it are Humane, and consequently the whole Mystery its self disputable, and left to the Understanding of Man to examine.

Now, whether the little Grounds Men pretend to for the support of this Mystery, be sufficient or not, is what I have undertaken to disprove, in answer to you by this following Treatise. And for my better Method, I shall distribute my Subject into Three Parts; to wit, The Proof of the Trinity, from, 1. Reason. 2. Scripture. And 3. Tradition. And herein I shall pursue your Method, and begin with Reason first.

REASON.

Your great support in reasoning, I see, Sir, is your self, and mutual consciousness, by which you would perswade us, that were even Three Angels self-conscious, that is, had they a mutual Knowledge and Sensation of each others Thoughts and Actions, they would be even Essentially One, and if so, much more Three Persons in the Godhead.

Know then, Sir, to avoid all needless Arguments, I will grant you, that your Creed, in this, may in a Sense be rational, and very near agreeable to what you have wrote in *Sect.* 2. Thus I will agree with you, as you ingeniously alledge, *p.* 49. and 68. *That Three Persons self-conscious and Immaterial, may in a sense be called One:* Nay, and not improperly give their first Commandment as One, as being inseparably united in Will and Wisdom; indeed, Sir, to do you right, what you have in this alledg'd, is the only thing that ever I saw like rational for the Trinity yet.

But yet then, I hope, if you make us grant you thus much, you will withal be as generous in your Concessions to us, and grant that this would be rather a Metaphorical, than a Real Unity in the Deity, and that if Three such Persons had given such

ſuch a Commandment, it would neither be conſiſtent with the Commandment we have already receiv'd, nor with that Law of Nature, which ſays, We have but one God. It is not conſiſtent with the Commandment, becauſe that would undoubtedly then be more diſtinct, had it bid us worſhip a co-equal Trinity in the One God: Nor with the Law of Nature, for in that it eludes us out of a real and individual Unity, by a Unity of Species.

Beſides, as you ſay your ſelf, *As by Natural Religion there can be but One God*, page 147. And *tho' there be ſeveral Perſons, yet they cannot act apart, but always with One Energy*, page 136. So your own Argument deſtroys it ſelf; for ſurely, where there are mean and under Offices between Perſons, the Energy is manifeſtly not One, nor the Act ſimple.

Nor will your Arguments, *page* 118. that the Trinity acts together, help you, for 'tis manifeſt by the Deſcent of the Holy Ghoſt on Chriſt like a Dove, that the Three Divine Perſons act ſeparately, as well as think ſo; ſo that if your own Arguments be conſiſtent, *page* 124. and *God be a pure and ſimple Act*; as you alledge, *page* 129. and 167. *And Alterity makes Duality*; as you likewiſe affirm, *page* 122. 'tis plain, theſe Three Perſons cannot make up ſuch a Deity as you would imagine; indeed they might be One in a Metaphor, and as in Scripture ſenſe, but to be really One is a Jeſt.

Give me leave therefore to tell you, Sir, that your Metaphyſicks has miſlead you a little here, for there is a One Imperfect, as well as One Perfect. The firſt is, when we ſay One Part, or One Multitude, which as it is rather a Metaphorical than a Real Unity in Nature, ſo Perſonation only is the real Unity, and as we may ſay, that Wiſdom in God is One, and Mercy in God is One, and yet as he is but One Perſon, he is moſt purely One ſtill: But after that, if you ſay he is Three Perſons, but yet by a Self-conſciouſneſs One, what is it but that by the Metaphorical Unity of a Multitudinary Relation, you deſtroy his Real Unity.

And beſides, conſider Sir, Is it rational, Self-conſcious and abſolute Coequals, ſhould take or impoſe ſervile and underling Offices of each other? Nay, and that the Son and Holy Ghoſt are conſcious to the Father, is abſolutely falſe and groundleſs, from Scripture, as I ſhall ſhew you in order.

But I ſee, Sir, you are reſolv'd not to be at a loſs, you will rather have two Strings to your Bow, than fail of your Mark, and therefore now, we muſt prepare our ſelves for St. *Auſtin*'s Self-conſciouſneſs: And in this you ſay, The Trinity *are conſcious to each other, as our Memory, Will, and Underſtanding are, which know and feel whatever is in each other.* Vide p. 50.

Alas, Sir, I wonder how that you, who live in the fuller Rays of Humane Learning, can brook the comparing of Faculties to Perſons, or how you can repeat ſuch Inconſiſtencies as they produce, before you acknowledg'd each Perſon compleat, and rational; and now you make *the Father impotent, and only a Speculation*, pag. 132. *and the reflex Wiſdom, or the Son of God, only powerful to act and create*: And again, by another turn, *pag.* 169. you make *him impotent too.*

In ſhort, Sir, I ſhall forbear to offend you, with all thoſe Comments I could make in this place, did I rather ſtudy Malice than Truth; but this you force me to declare, that if you take ſuch liberty to prove your Myſtery, as to make Perſons Faculties, and Faculties Perſons, as you do. 'tis impoſſible that any Reaſoning ſhould hold you; For by the ſame liberty, what

what may you not say? And what, Sir, do these Wiles look as from God?

And that the Reader may see you have not treated of these Faculty-Gods by chance *page* 135, you *attribute the Creation to them*, p. 182, 183, you make *the Father to have no Mercy* in himself; indeed, *pag.* 135, you would seem to palliate the matter, by saying, *The essential Character of the Holy Ghost, in the like case, is Love.* But, Sir, a running eye shews this to be all Mystery indeed, and really such an one as confounds Personality, Trinity, and Deity all at a stroke, v. *pag.* 130.

Besides, Sir, you make *Love in the Father to be the Holy Ghost, a Person, and God*, p. 133. And pray, Sir, why is not Hatred a Person in God, as well as Love? The Reason you give why Love is a Person, is because there can be no Accident in God, and therefore even an Affection in him is real, and makes a Person: But what, Sir, may not this Reason serve for Hatred, and an hundred Affections more?

Hereunto may be likewise added that other stretch of Dr. *W.* his Cube an Incomprehensible Example, and Illustration of as an Incomprehensible a Mystery, the length is a Cube, the depth is a Cube, and the breadth is a Cube, and yet there are not Three Cubes, but One Cube: And why might not the D-- have brought in a thousand Gods by a Chiliagone as well; or have illustrated it by Three Folds in an Handkerchief, as I heard a Country Fellow did it before him.

I shall add no more at present concerning the Reason of the two Hypothesis's, because it will fall more naturally in our way, as we examine the Scriptures; and indeed, I have wrote nothing at all here of the *Arrian* Hypothesis, because the Reasoning of it is so obvious, that it were to fire Candles to enlighten the Day, to illustrate it.

Give me leave therefore to advise you Sir, that for the future you be wary to reason more perfectly, or not at all; 'tis no light Truth that you have oppos'd, and I believe many a Reader would have had less Charity for what you have done, than I have; and may be would condemn you for beguiling with the appearance of Reasoning; but I neither think so of you, nor believe otherwise, than that your Paternal Zeal has misguided you.

As for the Contradictions of this Doctrine, I shall speak of them in their proper place; in the mean time, I shall pass on to Examine your Scripture-Interpretations: And by this time, I hope you are convinc'd, that you have jump'd out of the Frying-pan into the Fire, and instead of helping out an Absurdity by a Nicety, made it the more suspicious by defending it with a Fallacy.

To conclude, Sir, let your own Reputation, as well as the Honour of God move you to a Recantation in this Argument; let it not be said, Sir, that you ride Postilion to all the absurd Doctrines of the Age; let it not be said, that you are the only Man found to confound the Unity and Glory of God, and that against so expres light too, as to make Men call you a Divine, with a *Non obstante* to all Sence, Reason and Integrity.

Scripture-Interpretation.

Before I descend into Particulars, I shall write a little of the Interpretation of Scriptures in general; and methinks here it grieves me to see, how to make out this Mystery, Men have not stopt at any Arts, to force and wrest the Scriptures to this imaginary Truth.

I see well enough how you triumph in Scripture-force against us: But alas, you have

have not one expreſs Text againſt us; the greateſt in all pretence is, *John* 10. 30. which is ſo apparently interpreted by *cap.* 17. following; and ſo likewiſe *John* 1.1. by *Heb.* 8. 9. that there remains not the leaſt colour for it.

But on the other ſide, I have cited againſt you, *Heb.* 1. *Mark* 13. 32. and *John* 16. 13, 15. Texts that ſo clearly deſtroys your Hypotheſis, both as to Son and Holy Ghoſt, that I could almoſt ſay, you muſt be wilfully perverſe in wreſting Scripture to evade their force. But to return:

Page 153, you ſay, We ought not to force the Scriptures to preconceiv'd Notions: But what? is not this Myſtery ſuch? Surely, were a Pagan to read the Scriptures, the firſt Commandment would keep him ſo much as from ever dreaming of a Trinity; and I wonder really how it came into Mens Minds: I know the World would be apt enough to embrace it, when it once comes there, as their Superſtition has always enclin'd them to a Polytheiſm; but I ſhould have thought there had been a ſufficient Guard, againſt every colour of it in Chriſtianity.

But to maintain this Hypotheſis, now once up, let me beſeech you to conſider your own evaſive Conſtructions of Scripture; I am perſwaded, if you err, as I have ſaid, 'tis becauſe you have continued in your firſt Faith with too little circumſpection; and that the *Socinian* Hypotheſis has not appear'd natural to you; for you ſeem to have too much ſincerity, to do otherwiſe, and therefore I preſume this liberty with you.

Conſider then, I ſay, is it not ſtrange that you ſhould make the Son, know things as God, and not know them as Man, *p.* 177. Pray after what manner was the Godhead Incarnate, and what kind of Perſon was this, that by a kind of Ventriloquy you make to ſpeak ſomething as Divine, when the ordinary Perſon knows nothing of them himſelf? *p.* 270.

So, what an Anſwer you have there, that the Son was tempted as to his Manhood, but not as to his Godhead: And pray then where was the Godhead all the while, like *Baal*'s aſleep; or was the Man Chriſt now and then as it were poſſeſſed by Fits? Methinks I am aſham'd to handle the Abſurdities of this Hypotheſis, they make me giddy when I conſider them.

So in the ſame Page, in Interpreting, Mark 13. 32. *But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels that are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father*: Do you not think you wreſt and deſtroy the Scripture Sence, and in pretence of ſaying, St. *Matthew* has not what St. *Mark* has, blemiſh the cleareſt Text? You had better write down-right, like *Bellarmine*, Thou lieſt, St. *Mark*'s Goſpel is not true; or that Gradation, Man, Angel, or Son is impertinent, and then you would anſwer ſomething like, as if you defended a Myſtery.

Nor need the Reader admire at this as a ſingular Text againſt him; for indeed the whole Myſtery in this caſe is ſo much of a piece, that I here declare, If any Man ſhews me ſo much as one Text, that can with Sence be made to plead either for the Eternal Generation, the Homoouſios, or Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt, the three grand Foundations of this Myſtery, I will be his Convert immediately.

But by the way, you muſt excuſe me, Sir, if for Truth's-ſake, I am forc'd thus to make ſuch Reflections on your words, which tho' they may ſeem hard, yet are neceſſary; and yet not that they belong

ſo

ſo much unto you, as your Cauſe, which I cannot otherwiſe ſet to a full light, which I believe you have hitherto embrac'd with too much inadvertency, and in following the corrupt Interpretations of the Church with too much Zeal: But to return to my purpoſe:

Nor will your Evaſion of Self-conſciouſneſs, make God and Man One Perſon here, as you would inſinuate, *page* 262. for 'tis plain, God and Man are thus Two Perſons, if they acted together, and *God commanded the Reaſon regularly, as the Reaſon does the Sence*; as you urge, *pag.* 268, 9. there might be ſome pretence for their being One Perſon, but you ſee plainly, the Godhead exerts itſelf may be now and then as it liſts, nay, ever and anon, as it did at Chriſt's Crucifixion and Acclamation, left the Man by himſelf, and crying out upon the Godhead, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me.*

And what? Can here be any pretence then that the Godhead ſuffer'd? For ſhame, leave the Blaſphemy; and for his being conſcious to the Man Chriſt Jeſus, that that ſhould make him Incarnate, is ſuch a *ſhuffle*, that you had as good ſay, God is perſonally united to us all, becauſe he is conſcious to all our thoughts; as ſuppoſe a Perſonal Incarnation of God himſelf in Chriſt, on that account.

So that all that you alledge of the Incomprehenſibility of the Incarnation, will not ſalve your Sores, for all that you urge of that kind, *p.* 264, is but *gratis dictum*, and you ought to have more Truth in your Foundation, before you can juſtifie ſuch profound Myſteries in the Building.

So ſurely hereafter, Sir, you will be aſham'd to ſee how groundleſly you have made the Perſon of the Father ſignifie the whole Trinity, as you have done; I am perſwaded, if God ſhould mercifully open your eyes once to a Conviction, your own wrefted Allegations will ſettle and fix you for ever from wavering.

What you ſay *page* 89, and 193. *That the Son calls the Father the only true God*, Quatenus fons Deitatis; *and that not in oppoſition to the Perſons in Union with him, but the Falſe Gods*, page 185, 186. is ſo groundleſs, and withal ſo perverting a Conſtruction of Scripture, and meerly on the preſumption of your Hypotheſis, that I wonder how in fair Argument you can uſe it; nay, and when in the very Text you cite, you have the Father called the only true God, in oppoſition to the Son himſelf.

Sir, Give me leave to tell you, your Church and Self have by Time and Induſtry, given yourſelves ſuch Methods to blind your ſelves, like the ancient Aſtronomers, with ſo many Epicicles, and blind and precarious Principles, in leading your interpreting Scriptures, that without ſingular Courage and Integrity lead you, I may ſay, the peculiar Grace of God do it, indeed 'tis almoſt impoſſible to ſhew you Truth, you are ſo clouded and maz'd from it, by your own corrupt Subtleties in defending Error.

But yet, why do I accuſe you ſo far, you have already granted one half of what I deſire, That *ſo many leading Terms, as Hypoſtaſis*, &c. *are to be blam'd*, page 139. be pleas'd but to move one ſtep further, clap Homo-ouſios among them, which you confeſs is not in Scripture, *page* 15, and yield me, that our impoſing Explanations muſt at leaſt mud, if not corrupt the ſtream of Truth; and you ſhall ſee after that, that you and I ſhall never diſagree.

And indeed I cannot but reflect here likewiſe, on that little Treatiſe of Dr. *W*— who when he all along grants, that the Sence of the Words us'd by this Myſtery,

are not adequate to any common Conception of them, can yet be so unreasonable to write to justifie the Imposition of them.

I shall add no more in this place, but to shew you, how deep you are dipt by your Zeal in this Error, that *p.* 150, you can tell us, *We ought not to interpret Scriptures by reason*; *the Reason* you assign us is, because we must observe the Propriety of Words and Phrases, and the Scope of the Text: And what then, Sir, is not Reason to enquire and rule those? You had as good say, she has no concern in Language; And pray in what has she more? But I shall forbear further Reflections.

☞ Reader, I beg the D's Pardon here, for upon Examination I find I misunderstood his meaning in this place, which since I find is good and worthy; to wit, That when we would interpret a Writer, we ought to pursue the natural force of his Context; and if he err let him do so, but we ought not therefore to wrest his Intentions, thô even to the fair Scheme of Truth.

INCARNATION.

I have hitherto shewn you, how much you have err'd in your general Interpretation of Scripture, and I shall now proceed to rectifie your Errours in particulars, wherein I shall be the larger, that I may comprehend the Objections of the late Dr. *S*----, and others, on my Subject: I shall begin first with the Incarnation.

Now that I may the better shew the Errors of the Incarnation, as in your Hypothesis, I shall state it, as it lies most naturally in mine: Know then, that thô I do not violently acknowledge the Son of God to be co-equal to the Father, yet I freely grant him to be as Great and Eminent as God could possibly make him.

Sir, I do not imagine *a Prosopopeia Incarnate*, as you suggest, *p.* 227. nor do I make the Godhead carry about, and now and then possess a Body, as I have shewn your Trinity Hypothesis will necessitate; but I suppose the great God and Angel, who under the Father fram'd all things, to satisfie God's Justice, and destroy the Malice of Satan, and to redeem his own, willingly condescended, that through the Power of God, his Being might be reduc'd as to a first Semen, and so he might live with Purity, and suffer under that Trial, that no Creature but himself could be able, besides, to accomplish with any certainty, for our Redemption.

This, Sir, I conceive, is the great Mystery of the Incarnation; and this, methinks, carries some semblance of Rationality; for if we from little Semens, may hereafter grow to the most considerable degrees of Glory, as the Scriptures assures us, surely there can be no impossibility, nor difficulty, that God should be able to reduce the most glorious of his Beings back again, and make them, as from the first Seed of a Soul, arrive to their Ancient Glory.

But to this you say, *page* 244, That *there is no greater Nonsence in the World, than a Made-God, and a Creature-God*: Sir, the Proposition is bold, but you have not stoop'd to a proof of it; however I hope to shew you, 'tis neither Nonsence nor Absurd; I must confess, a Creature God to be imagin'd the Supream, were absurd; but when I say a Creature-God, I only mean a Spirit of an ubiquitary Presence, and multitudinary Power; or one that by a perfect Self-consciousness, can reason with infinite Beings at once.

If then, Sir, you will not deny it to be in the Power of God to create such a Spirit,

rit, which I hope, Sir, you will not; for I ſhould be ſorry to ſee my words draw you to blaſpheme that Power, which you can know no Limits of, but Vice, Error, and Weakneſs: If you'l grant me, I ſay, that God can make ſuch a Power, I will add, he has; for ſurely, to make ſuch more glorious Beings, is much more for his Honour, than all little, ſingle, and weak Individuals, as You and I are.

But you ſay, *page* 159,160. What *ſhall a meer Man be exalted above Angels?* Yes ſurely, if he were firſt above them, and laid aſide his Being only for a time, and in Obedience to his God: And what ſay you? *Can anything under infinite Wiſdom Rule the World?* Yes, Sir, God's moſt glorious Son, that is wiſer than all Men and Angels beſides, and that is in the Boſome of the Father, and ſo has his aſſiſtance, may rationally do it. And pray, Sir, where are the Abſurdities and Contradictions of theſe things?

Methinks, Sir, in this you ſhould have been aſham'd of your Reaſoning: *You can allow God's begetting a Son co-equal Rational, page* 221. but 'tis with an horrour, that you deteſt an Angel-God: But pray, Sir, if the Notion of God's begetting a Son be not Carnal, tell me why he has no more Sons than One? You dare not blaſpheme him ſure, to ſay he is not more fruitful; or are you ſo niggardly, to think, he can multiply his glorious Iſſue too faſt.

But to return to my Subject: Hence it was, if you would know, *That the Son ſays he could do nothing of himſelf*, pag. 169. and hence it was, *That whilſt Incarnate he had need of the help of the Holy Ghoſt:* But the Reaſons that you have given in theſe things, are ſo ſhuffling, *pag.* 187, 270. that I bluſh to read them.

So that all the Objections I know, againſt this Hypotheſis, is but, that 'tis the Platonick Phyloſophy made Chriſtian; and as to that, I ſhall only ſay this: Is Truth the worſe, becauſe *Plato* hapned to Idea it; or is Chriſtianity to be diſ-eſteem'd, becauſe a Philoſopher chanc'd to be in ſome of her Roads.

But leaſt any one ſhould think that the Doctrine of *Plato* ſhould have the leaſt influence, in wreſting the Scriptures to this Hypotheſis, I do hereby in the preſence of God declare, what it was that firſt mov'd my Judgment, and turn'd me to be an *Arrian*; and if it did me, it ſhould move us in Charity to think it did others.

An Acquaintance of mine, ſpeaking by chance of the Trinity, told me, Some thought it a breach of the firſt Commandment; and to convince me, 'twas not reveal'd in the New Teſtament, ſhew'd me that moſt notable Chapter of the firſt of the *Hebrews:* Now he little thought what he had done, when he did this; for thô my Zeal boyl'd againſt his Blaſphemy, as I thought it for a time, yet when I reflected again with my ſelf, I thought at leaſt, his Diſcourſe had rais'd ſuch Scruples in my Mind, that the very conſiderableneſs of the firſt Commandment would neceſſitate me to enquire of.

Now this was not only all the Diſcourſe I had with him. but I remember to this day, that I could never underſtand by his Diſcourſe, whether he were *Arrian* or *Socinian*, nor indeed what either Hypotheſis was; thô lately, I muſt confeſs, I have perceiv'd him rather enclin'd to the *Socinians.*

But thus it was, that ſhortly after going for *London*, where my Doubt continuing upon me, I reſolv'd to give my ſelf ſatisfaction: I ſought for Books, but found none; indeed I did not know what to enquire for; whereupon reſolving to know that by my ſelf, which I could not by others, without either knowing of *Arrianiſm*, *Socinianiſm*,

cinianiſm, or *Platoniſm*, I took this following courſe:

I took the New Teſtament, where I conceiv'd this Truth was to be found reveal'd, if any where, and reading it with attention, I collected every Text relating to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, into an Imperial ſheet of Paper; for neither liking giddy Tradition, nor the tricks of wreſting ſingle Texts, I thought that this could be the only way to find the Truth by, if any.

Now God is my Witneſs, that when I did thus, I could not but fall into *Arrianiſm*; not that I then knew what Name my Opinion had; but ſome time after meeting with Books, I ſaw the difference of *Arrianiſm* and *Socinianiſm*; and found that I was not ſingular in my Sentiments, but that the World had thought the ſame before me.

Nor was this all, but before I knew that my Hypotheſis had been known to the World, thinking that I was ſingular in the Truth, I reſolv'd in Charity to Mankind to publiſh my diſcovery, till ſome Friends hearing of it, adviſ'd me to conſider firſt, that I might be as much blinded by my own Pride of Search, as the World was by their Corruption and Traditions.

Upon this, reſolving to be reſign'd to Truth, and fearing leſt my Preſumption might ruine me, I not only took all my Papers and burnt them, but reſolv'd to read all Books for the Trinity, and converſe all Perſons, and if poſſible; ſatisfie my ſelf to believe, and acquieſce in ſo great a Myſtery.

But alas, Sir, after all this care, you ſee I am forc'd to differ from you; ſo that thô I would willingly lay by my Sentiments, the better to examine Truth for a while, yet when on ſearch I could ſtill do no otherwiſe, than think my Old Opinion the beſt, I durſt not leave Truth for ever; and I hope the neceſſity of my Caſe will at leaſt induce you to a Charity for me.

But that I may return from this Digreſſion, and the better evidence to you, that theſe *God-Angels* are no Novelties in Scripture, let me add hereto an Idea of the Nature of Spirits, as I have taken it even from the Scriptures themſelves; and thus there are Gods, 1 *Cor.* 8.5, 6. 2 *Cor.* 4.4. Potentates, Principalities, Rulers, and Dominions, *Col.* 1.16. *Eph.* 6.12---1. 20, 21. and Angels, *&c.*

God, ſignifies a Spirit of a Univerſal Power, ſo that thô there be but One Supream God, the Father, yet he has conſtituted the Son and Holy Ghoſt, two Deputies under him, 1 *Cor.* 12.4, 5, 6. *Rev.* 5.6. *John* 16.12, 13, 14, 15. calling the Son an Angel in this deputation, in the Old Teſtament, *Exod.*23.20, 21. *Eccl.*5.6. *Iſai.* 63.9.

And on this Foundation ſtand thoſe Expreſſions, *Let us make Man*, &c. *Gen.*1.26. ---3.22.---11.6, 7. And thus, through the Son it is that we are ſaid to have *Acceſs*, by one Spirit to the Father, *Eph.*2.18. *Rev.* 1.4, 5. And thus it is, that the Holy Ghoſt, and Satan the *Evil God*, 2 *Cor.* 4.4. *John* 14.30. *Eph.*2.2. *Rev.*12.9.---20.8. *Matth.* 25.41. *John* 8.44. are in us like two contrary prompting and ruling powers, 1 *Joh.* 4.6. 1 *Sam.*18.10. 1 *Cor.*2.12.

Thus it is, that the Son, as Governour under the Father of theſe two leſſer Gods, adminiſters the Gifts of the One, *Rom.* 8. 26, 27. 1 *Cor.* 12.4, 5, 6. *John* 16. 13. and reſtrains the Temptations of the other, 1 *Cor.*10.13. whilſt they are in a perpetual War in us; that is, all Mankind at once, 1 *John* 4.6. 1 *Cor.* 2. 12. *John* 14. 26.---8.38.---16.7. *Zech.* 13.2. *Nehem.* 9. 20. *Rev.*2.13.---12.9, 10.---20.2, 3. 1 *Kings* 22.21, 22. *Rom.*8.26. *Mark* 4.15. 2 *Tim.*2. 26. one helping in us the other tempting us,

us, one comforting us, and the other accusing us, one having seven the Number of Perfection attributed to him, *Rev.* 5. 6. —12. 3. as likewise has the other.

And thus you are to understand the Texts of a universal good Angel, *Eccl.* 5. 6. *Psal.* 34. 7. *Isa.* 63, 9. *Matth.* 18. 20. *Eph.* 4. 10. and a Universal Evil One, *Zech.* 13. 2. *Rev.* 12. 9. and thô some have thought both Satan and the Holy Ghost, rather Names of Orders of Spirits, than *God-Angels*, citing for it *Rev.* 1. 4.—3. 1.—4. 5. —5. 6. *Tobit* 12. 15. *Zech.* 3. 9.—4. 10. yet 'tis plain by the whole course of Scripture that those places more rationally ought to be understood that those Gods have Principalities, and Angels, *&c.* which are sometimes employ'd by them in Offices under them.

If you desire to see this Matter more amply argued, you must read M. *Bidell's* Twelve Arguments of the Holy Ghost, who when he made the Holy Ghost so considerable as he did, I wonder how he could continue a *Socinian* longer; for the Scriptures so plainly set the Son above the Holy Ghost, and tell us, That all Power is given to the Son both in Heaven and Earth, which he cannot possibly otherwise manage, that I admire he did not turn *Arrian* throughout.

But to return; this Order of God's Administration through the Son, and by the Holy Ghost, appears more plainly, when we consider their *gradative* Stiles in Scripture, and the Apostles Creed; thus the Father only is called God in our Creed, as only being so; the Son called Lord, as he only really is so under him, 1 *Cor.* 8. 5, 6. and the Holy Ghost, or Spirit, only stiled Holy, in opposition to the Evil One.

And thus, the Divine Benefits we receive, as from the Father, are called Love and Operation, from the Son, Grace and Administration; but from the Holy Ghost and lesser Power, only Gift and Fellowship, 1 *Cor.* 12. 4, 5, 6. 2 Cor. 13, 14. and hence it was, that all Communication between the Father and Holy Ghost, being through the Son, *Prophesies* ceas'd while the *Son was Incarnate.*

Next unto these, as I have said, succeed Principalities, Powers, and Dominions: Now these, by their very Names shew themselves to be as lesser Deputies; that is, as Governours of Provinces and Kingdoms, *under the Gods of the World*, the Holy Ghost and Satan; and for these and their Offices, you may see *Dan.* 10. 12, 13, 20, 21.—12. 1. *Acts* 16. 9.

Lastly, As for Angels, I need say nothing of them, seeing their Names declare their Offices, and the Scriptures abound with Examples of their performing them; thus an Angel came to the *Virgin Mary*, to *Cornelius*, and several others; so that of this enough: And if any thing remain, it must be to explain the reasonableness of these Hierarchys.

I say therefore, when we think to reason of Spirits, we must freely allow our selves an open and generous source of Thought; for as the Air, and much more they are too fine for the gross Casements of our Eyes; so if we design duly to examine their Nature, we must be able to walk without Sense a little, and not think to grope grossly after them, as if we would feel them.

First then, I lay it down as a Rule, That Spirits are Immortal, and have no need of any nourishment, nor do, nor need we doubt this, when we consider even how the Sun has subsisted, how his unwearied Rays impair him not, and how so many Thousand Years has not exhausted his Source of glowing Fuel.

Secondly,

Secondly, To this I must add that I cannot but believe, that like unto Clouds in the Air, they gradually subsist in each other, by the proportional Purity of each others Substances; nor need this be strange to us, for this is evident, that God at least exists in all of them, and rules them as easily as they by his permission can us; and if so, what hinders but that he may have Deputy-Gods to do the like under him.

Nor can it well be otherwise, than that they should rule one another thus, through their gradual Purity and Inexistency; for when we consider, that Devils are entirely wicked, and are not to be ruled otherwise than through a real force, there remains no doubt, but that as they are in subjection to one another, so it is through such a real force as this, that neither Art, nor Conspiracy can destroy.

But yet, after all this, methinks I hear you object, that this is difficult to conceive, that any Creature should be of so extensive a Power; And yet why so? Does not the Sun do the same thing in the Sensible and Vegetable World? And shall we think as general a power in a Spirit, that as easily pierces the thickest Bodies, as he does the Air, impossible; nay, or so much as difficult, in the rational World: But what? We know not how it is done, no more we know not how God, and our own Spirit exist within us.

To conclude, I shall only add, that this being once granted, there remains no difficulty to imagine, how all our Spiritual Actions are perform'd, and how we are tempted; thus only the Supream God, and his Son, possibly may see our Thoughts, the lesser Gods, the Holy Ghost and Satan, may only have power of Hieroglyphick Imagery in Dreams, and prompting us, while Potentates and Angels, may only have power to rule and converse us.

But of this enough; and I shall now proceed to handle those particular Texts, that you, and others have cited against us.

Particular TEXTS.

[*John* 1.1.] *Page* 216. you tell us, *In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God:* And what Sir, can be more agreeable to an Hypothesis, than this to ours? May I tell you more agreeable, than the Trinitarian, for here is no mention of a Union of these two, but that in the beginning of all Things there was a God, which we beheld as the Word on the Earth, that existed with the Supream God, that as his Instrument made all things, that is, all things besides himself and God, according to *1 Cor.* 15. 27. and that coming to his own to redeem them, they knew him not: And here, Sir, your Charges against the *Socinians*, not only vanish to Air, but turn against you, when us'd by the *Arrians.*

Now, that you may not take our Idea of the Son to be groundless, I shall give it you thus, from Scripture its self: He is the beginning of the Creation of God, *Rev.* 3. 14. *Col.* 1. 15. *Eccles.* 1. 4, 9.—24. 9. for Righteousness exalted to be God's Son, *Hebr.* 1. 2 *Pet.* 1.17. and yet as so wholly dependant on the Father, *John* 5. 26. —10.29.—14 28.

So he is likewise made our Universal Lord and Ruler, *1 Cor.* 15. 24, 25, 27, 28. *Phil.* 2. 11. *Dan.* 7. 13, 14. *Eph.* 1. 17, 20, 21, 22, 23. Nay, even Lord of All, with express Eminence, *Acts* 2. 36—10. 36. *Phil.* 2. 11. *Luke* 2. 11. *John* 13. 3, 13. *Matth.* 22. 43, 44. and Judge, *John* 5. 22. 30. *Matth.* 24. 30, 31. *Mat.* 16. 26. who before his Incarnation, was that Word, by whom God made the Worlds, and fram'd all Things, *John* 1: *Heb.* 1. 2.—10. 2, 10. *Eph.* 3. 9. *1 Cor.* 8. 6. whether

whether visible or invisible, *Col.* 1. 16,17. but yet so as an Instrument only, *Eph.* 3. 9. *Heb.* 1. 2, 10. 1 *Cor.* 8. 6—15. 27, 28. Which Texts, I must agree with you, Sir, I think the *Socinians wrongfully wrest* to a New Creature.

Further, thô the Son be often called God in Scripture, as *John* 20. 28. *Acts* 20. 28. *Rom.* 9. 5. yet that can give us no ground to equal him to the Father, the Supream God, because God is not only a Title, as I have said often, bestow'd on Creatures, *Exod.* 7. 1—22. 28. *Psalm* 97. 7. 2 *Cor.* 4. 4. but is particularly intended to the Son as such, as you may see, *John* 10. 35, 36. 1 *Cor.* 8. 5, 6. where he is only declared to be Lord by it, which is a Title inferiour and subordinate to God.

[*Prov.* 8. 30.] Your next Text I shall speak to, is, *Prov.* 8. 30. Then I was by him, as one brought up with him, and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him. And what, Sir, does this look, as if there was a coequality to be represented? No surely, the Text aggrandizes the Person of the Father too much; and when you consider it, I doubt not, but you will grant me so.

Nor need I give you other Answer here, since you know I grant Christ in his preexistent state, *John* 17. 5, 24—13. 3. *Phil.* 2. 6, 7. 1 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5, 9. *Luke* 13. 34, 35. to be a Spirit of a Universal Power, 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. *Mat.* 23. 37—28. 18—18. 20. *Eph.* 4. 10. who laying aside his blessed State, *John* 17. 5. *Heb.* 1. 7, 8, 9, 10. *Eph.* 4. 10. *John* 6. 62. was deputed into Incarnation, *John* 17. 3, 18. *Heb.* 5. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. and rewarded for it, *Heb.* 12. 2. *Phil.* 2. 6, to 11. *Eph.* 1. 20, 21, 22, 23. 1 *Pet.* 1. 21. being made our Mediator, the Lord of our Temple and Sabbath, and King and Spouse to the Universal Church, *Mat.* 12. 6. 8. *Mark* 2. 28.

[*Exod.* 23. 20.] Pag 229, you say, That there are many Texts in the Old Testament, even by Christ and his Apostles, applied to himself, as then in being; and I grant it you, thus *Zech.* 12. 10. They shall look on me whom they have pierced, *page* 208, and in *Malachy*, Behold I will send my Messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me, *page* 235, answering to *Mat.* 3. 3. But what benefit will these Texts do you? Nothing really, but confound your Hypothesis.

'Tis true, Christ did appear in being in the Old Testament, but as but an Angel, bearing the Name of God, *Gen.* 16. 10—18. 1, 2, 22—19. 1—48. 16. *Isai.* 6. 1. *Ezek.* 1. 26, 28. 2 *Esd.* 2. 42, to 48. *Eccl.* 5. 6. *Numb.* 20. 16. *Exod.* 23. 20, 21, 22. referr'd to 1 *Cor.* 10. 4, 5, 9. once in Eminence called, The Angel of the Presence, *Isai.* 63. 9. and as he is sometimes called in the New Testament too, *Heb.* 1. 7, 8, 9. *Rev.* 8. 3. *Who taking flesh upon him*, shew'd as much by the Agonies he was in, *Mat.* 26. 39—27. 46. *Luke* 22. 43.

But to pretend, that there could be the Union of two Rationals, a God and a Soul in a Body to make a Person; or that the Godhead could possibly divest itself of Power and Knowledge, to possess the Body of an Infant; or that it was otherwise in Christ, who like others was a Child, and grew in knowledge by degrees; are such Principles, that without Men lay by their Reason with their Religion beyond retrieve, I wonder they are not asham'd of.

Besides, even the satisfaction of Christ as God, seems irrational; What must we make our Creatour suffer for us, e're he can pardon us, and imaginarily manage the Machine of a Humane Body, to attone to himself, and by himself? What looks more impertinent and absurd?

But that *Christ* the Lord of all Creatures, should

ſhould attone to their God for them, nothing ſeems more rational or juſt, if he deſign'd to ſatisfie God's Juſtice, to deſtroy the Works of the Devil in *Adam*, and bring us to Glory, *Heb.*2. 9, 10. And upon this account it was, that for all Chriſt's Prayer, That if it were poſſible this Cup ſhould paſs from him: God's Juſtice would not let it, indeed he is too impartial even to ſpare his own Son.

[*Heb.* 1.] Next, I ſhould ſpeak of the Text, *Heb.* 1. quoted from *Pſal.* 102. 25, 26, 27. and mention'd in your Book, *pag.* 200. how *Chriſt fram'd the World*, which you know I deny not; however, give me leave to tell you, that that Context utterly deſtroys your Hypotheſis, thô it does not mine; for how you will reconcile theſe words, *Being made ſo much better then the Angels*, v. 4. And *thou haſt lov'd Righteouſneſs, and hated Iniquity, and therefore God, even thy God has anointed thee with the oyl of gladneſs above thy fellows*, viz. *Angels in the Context, I know not*; and yet you ſee Chriſt is called God, that is, is mentioned in his higheſt degree, in the ſame Context, *v.* 8, 9.

So that I hope, Sir, if our Brother *Socinus* cannot pleaſe you, as wreſting too much the Scriptures in his Interpretations, as you complain, *pag.* 229, 230, yet the *Arrian* may give you ſatisfaction, and ſhew you there is an Hypotheſis more apt, may I ſay, almoſt infinitely than the Trinity.

John 3. 16. *Page* 238, you tell us, *The Fundamental Myſtery of Chriſtianity is, that God ſo loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whoſoever believeth in him ſhould not periſh, but have everlaſting Life*: And I agree with you, Sir, provided you will but take away your additional ſtretch of an Eternal Generation to the Words, and let the Scripture interpret them.

Now the ground upon which the Scriptures ſay Chriſt is called God's Son, you may ſee plainly, *Acts* 13. 32, 33. *Heb.* 1. 4, &c. *Luke* 1. 35. *Rom.* 1. 4. 2 *Pet.*1. 17. and ſo for his Reſurrection, which God accompliſh'd for him, *Act.* 2. 31, 32--13. 33, 35. But where is it we are to find, he is his Son through an Eternal Generation? Not ſurely becauſe he is called God's Son; for that he was not, unleſs prophetically, before his Incarnation, nor only begotten; for that he might be only as he was God's eminenteſt, and only peculiar Creature, indeed the Texts before cited, take away all other Myſtery from the Word whatever.

So for his being without Sin in the Fleſh, it might be, becauſe, as I ſaid, he was immediately God's Creation, whereas all things elſe were made by him, and through him, and conſequently more imperfect; and for that cauſe too, he may properly be called his only begotten Son, and his expreſs Image, as no one beſides has, or is capable of managing an entire Deputation under him.

And upon this account indeed it was too, that he alone was able to bear the weight of the Prophecies, and Tryals incident to our Redemption; for if I may ſo ſay, not only the Tryals were too hazardous to be ventur'd at by an ordinary Angel, but no One, except the Great Lord of the Creation, would be like to ſhew ſo great a Love to it, in its Redemption, *Heb.* 2. 9, 10.

Beſides, as God's Juſtice is moſt impartial, ſo even thô the Son undertook the Office, he was not favoured in it; thus when he became Incarnate, he had no Power of his own, *Mat.*26. 53. *John* 11. 41, 44. nor was he called to his Office, till he had firſt ſought to God with tears, *Heb.* 5. 7, 8. and when he was too, he was often left to the ſharpeſt Tryals alone, or elſe he

he could never have cry'd out, *My God, my God, why haſt thou forſaken me*, when he was upon the Croſs, as he did.

Indeed, had he not then been wholly dependant on the Father, *John* 5. 10, to 30. *Heb.* 2. 4. *Mat.* 12. 18, 28. *John* 3. 31. *Acts* 10. 38--2. 22, 31, 32--3. 15. *Luke* 3. 22--4. 18. *John* 6. 57. 8, 28, 29--10. 29--11. 42--12, 49, 50--14, 28. 2 *Cor.* 4. 14.--13. 4. and directed by the Holy Ghoſt, *Mat.* 14. 23. and as ſo dependant on God's Grace, he had been no apt Pattern for us, *Rom.* 8. 29. *Luke* 6. 12. *John* 15. 9, 10. as he is now, when ſubject to like Infirmities, *Mat.* 27. 46.--26. 38, 39. *Luke* 22. 43. *Mark* 15. 34--14. 35, 36. and yet not but that I grant, that after he was once rais'd again from the Dead by God, *Acts* 2. 24, 32--3. 15, 26--13, 32, 33. after his Aſcention he receiv'd his Power again, *Mat.* 28. 18.

[*Phil.* 2. 6.] Another Text you urge againſt us is, That 'tis ſaid of Chriſt, *Phil.* 2. 6. *That he thought it no robbery to be equal to God*, v. *page* 240, 244. But whatever you ſurmize, this Text will do you but little benefit, for what is this but to require what I have granted, that Jeſus Chriſt is abſolute Lord to all the Glory of the Father; and indeed, Sir, if you would have but look'd a little further, to *v.* 9. and 10, you would have ſeen the Apoſtle himſelf, apply this my Interpretation according to 1 *Cor.* 15. 27, 28.

So *page* 239, you tell us, *He took upon him the form of a Servant*: And *page* 242, you ſay, That *that proves his Pre-exiſtence*: And I grant it you: And what, Sir, is not this agreeable to my Hypotheſis? But you add *page* 242, That *it was matter of free choice*: And have I not ſaid the ſame? Indeed, you have added *page* 244, *That there is not greater Nonſence, than a Creature-God*: But, Sir, then you ſhould have prov'd it.

John 2. 19. 21. Page 233 you tell us, *The Temple was a Type of Chriſt*: As you urge it more ſtrongly *page* 234, 235. And indeed, Sir, you are in the right; but I hope you weild this Sword againſt the *Socinians*, and not the *Arrians*. So *page* 237 you tell us of the *Types of Sacrifice*; but in all theſe things we agree with you, Sir; and our Cauſe ought to loſe no Reputation, by your Imputations; and therefore excuſe me if I put in thus a Caveat here and there, leaſt another Reader, if not your ſelf, may be miſlead by them.

John 10. 30. But now I am come to your great Charge, Sir; *I and my Father are One*: And here you prepar'd your ſelf before, with your Self-conſciouſneſs, *p.* 57. but as to that, I think I have anſwer'd you ſufficiently already; ſo that I hope, even your ſelf will judge, that the Text *John* 17. 20, 21. alledg'd by you, *p.* 62. will be a ſufficient Anſwer to you, for all your fine-ſpun Evaſions, *p.* 61, 62, 63.

1 *John* 5. 7. The ſame Anſwer I ſhall rerurn you to the Text: There are Three that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghoſt, and thoſe Three are One: and indeed Sir, without queſtioning the Authority of this place, what can we rationally mean by this Text; unleſs One in bearing Record, according as 1 *Cor.* 3. 8. and the Context directs?

So *page* 51, you alledge, that becauſe Chriſt ſaid, *The Father is in me, and I in him*, that therefore they are eſſentially One; as likewiſe, becauſe Chriſt is ſaid to be *in the Boſome of the Father*: But alas Sir, your Inference is ſo weak, and theſe Expreſſions ſo much better ſuit my Hypotheſis than yours, that they deſerve not an Anſwer; For pray Sir, let me ask you, Who is to be cheriſh'd in the Boſom? What, a Co-equal? And is not the other Expreſſion adequate to both Hypotheſis alike?

So *page* 50 you ſay, *The Son perfectly knows the Father.* And *page* 59 you alledge a Scripture to prove it, which denies it, indeed, which ſhews you he knows but what the Father ſees good to tell him: Beſides Sir, in this matter you have us'd ſuch a ſhuffling Method of anſwering, as I ſhew'd you before, in treating about the Hour of Judgment, that Chriſt knows not ſomething as Man, and yet all things on occaſion as God, in the ſame Perſon, that really till your Hypotheſis let you write better, you deſerve no Anſwer.

John 2. 25. But as a ſtrengthning to this, may be alledg'd, what you have wrote *page* 245, that Chriſt tells us, *He knew what was in man:* And no doubt of it, Sir, he needed not that any Man ſhould teſtifie of Man; but does this therefore argue, he had not this knowledge from the Father, by the Holy Ghoſt.

Beſides, Sir, if you mean that in his pre-exiſtent ſtate he ſees our Thoughts, as you ſeem to alledge *page* 248, and 252, I anſwer you, I never denied it; but if you think he knew what was in Man whilſt Incarnate, otherwiſe than by Revelation, I muſt confeſs you make me diſſent from you; for if he had, he could never have ask'd Men occaſionally ſo many Queſtions as he did: as when he ask'd his Diſciples, What *John* thought of him? And what Men ſaid of him?

Mat. 21. 18. Page 247 you tell us, *That Chriſt had all power both in heaven and earth given him:* But I wonder you will cite a Text ſo much againſt you; for if it was given him, was there not a time then, that he had it not, that is, during his Incarnation, according to *John* 17. And if ſo, what good will all your little Arguings, *page* 248, 250, and 251, do you.

You know, Sir, whatever the *Socinians* do, our Hypotheſis ſuppoſes him eminently the Son of God, *John* 19. 7—20. 31. and the Univerſal Lord, *Acts* 2. 36—10. 36. nor do we deny him properly to be called a God, provided it be expreſſed as in the Scripture, in ſubordination to the Father, *Heb.* 1. 8, 9. for there in his higheſt Glory and Exaltation, he is always put under the Father, 1 *Cor.* 15. 27, 28. *Rev.* 3. 12. *Phil.* 2. 11. *John* 20. 17. *Eph.* 1. 17, 20, 21, 22.

Mat. 9. 6. But you ſay, *page* 249, *That the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive ſins:* But what then? That it was not his own Power, appears by his Anſwer to the Sons of *Zebbedee*, Mat. 20. 23. which he would not have given, had he been a Supream and Co-equal God; nay, more, to confirm this, he declares he knows not the Hour of Judgment, *Mark* 13. 32. 1 *Tim.* 6. 15. Indeed, after his Reſurrection he tells us, The Father hath put all Times and Seaſons in his own Power, *Acts* 1. 7. And tells us, That God gave him even the Revelations to ſhew unto his Servants, *Rev.* 1. 1.

John. 5. 25. The laſt Text I ſhall write of in general of the Son, is, That all Men ſhould honour the Son, as they honour the Father: and this *p.* 173, you ſay, *Ought to be equal to the Honour we pay the Father:* and I prettily obſerve, that you put off, that God appointed that Honour, on pretence, that 'tis natural for the Son to receive Honour by the Father.

So *page* 253, 254, 255. you are upon a continuation of the ſame Argument: But alas, how woodenly: No Reader can peruſe you, and not ſee. *Page* 62, you can grant your ſelf, that (as) ſignifies a likeneſs, and not always ſameneſs in degree; And if ſo, why cannot our Brother *Socinian's* Anſwer ſerve you?

But however, that we may put this matter out of all doubt? Pray, Sir, conſider a little, is there no difference, between the great Son of God our Mediator, and every little

little Creature, and is not there a difference between a Mediator appointed by *God*, and one ſet up meerly by the whimſie of Man? If theſe are not good Reaſons for your giving to Chriſt Honour as a Mediatour, I know not what are, I am ſure they are better, than to make God ſtoop to ſuch a petty Honour, as to be abſurdly Mediator to himſelf.

But you have a further Argument, *page* 205. from 2 *Phil.* 9.10,11. That *at the Name of Jeſus every knee ſhall bow*——and that *every tongue ſhall confeſs*, (But what?) *that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the glory of the Father.* And who ſhall deny you this Honour? Not I: no, I will grant it you in confuſion to your own Hypotheſis; for 'tis ſuch a Lord, and not a God, that I would have you think him to be.

Now, that we might the better underſtand what Honour is due to the Son, the Scripture hath expreſly called it, and appointed it to be Meditation, *Acts* 4. 10, 11,12. *John* 14.13. *Eph.*3.20,21. *Phil.*2.9. *Rom.*1.8.---5.11. *Col.*3.16,17. *John* 16.23, 26. but yet not ſo as that we ſhould pray to him for our Mediation, no more than we are to pray to him for any thing elſe.

Nor ought any other Worſhip to be paid him, unleſs perſonally preſent, and then as the only Son of God, and Lord of the World, he requires it, and ſuch Worſhip is what is given him, *Hebr.*1.6. where the following Verſes 7, 8, 9. plainly ſhew it not to be intended of the Supream Worſhip, but as is mentioned, *Rev.* 5.9,10,11, 12, 13. becauſe God for his excellency and worthineſs has appointed him that Honour.

Laſtly, To account 2 *Cor.* 13. 14. for a Supream Adoration, were to make *Gen.* 48. 16. ſo too; and as for the Worſhip of the Holy Ghoſt, as you your ſelf can as good as confeſs, *page* 194. there is no mention made of it in the whole Scriptures: ſo that you may ſee on what a rotten Foundation your Faith ſtands; and indeed, were not the Truth I write for now, near as clear as the Sun at Noon, I ſhould not be ſo zealous for it.

Mediatory Kingdom.

I proceed now to write of Chriſt's Mediatory Kingdom; and here I cannot but obſerve, how the Trinitarian Hypotheſis diſtorts the whole frame of Truth, makes God a Mediator to himſelf, and a Coequal take as an Honour an underling Office, whereas Chriſt in the *Arrian* Idea, as the great Son of God, is fit to be our Mediator between God and his Handiwork, and may be deſervedly honour'd with the Title, that he alone can prevail with God for mercy for us.

And here I cannot but let you ſee, Sir, with what falſe colours you would magnifie this Office, to make it rational for a Coequal to accept of it; thus *page* 159. you make it nothing, That *God exalted him to it:* and ſo *page* 163. That he was forc'd *firſt to ſuffer for it*, and then receive it as a Gift; whereas indeed, if he were a Coequal, it were both ſervile and degrading to him, even to accept it, thô on any Tearms, and thô with a Reward.

So *page* 173. I cannot but admire, to ſee how you [glorious] out this Kingdom, how you would fain ſeem to make it command the Father; when alas, Sir, you know your ſelf, all the Power of this Kingdom, is but an humble Interceſſion, *p.*179. Indeed your Argument, *p.* 176. and 243. That *no One but a God can adminiſter it*; is ſomewhat forcible againſt the *Socinians*, but can be of no force for you againſt the *Arrians.*

But why do I uſe more words, That all Power in Heaven and Earth were given him after his death, *Matth.*28.18. If a

God coequal before, were Nonſenſe, and as a Creature-God, your ſelf ſays he cannot exerciſe it; ſo that Propheſies ſhould ceaſe, as they did while he was Incarnate, *John* 7.39.---16.7,13,14,15. were abſurd; otherwiſe, indeed, you might as juſtly frame a Mediatory Kingdom, to interpret that great Text of the Holy Ghoſt, *John* 16. 13,14,15. as build ſuch a groundleſs one as this for Chriſt.

Of the Three Perſons together.

Having premiſed thus much in general of the Son, and indeed on whom almoſt depends the whole hinge of the Controverſie, I ſhall now proceed to ſhew you how the whole Three Perſons are treated, when they are named together in Scripture, that you may ſee even there our Hypotheſis prevails alſo.

Know then, that in ſuch places the Father is repreſented as our God diſtinct and ſolely, the Son our Lord diſtinct and wholly, and the Holy Ghoſt only as our aiding Spirit or Comforter, *Eph.* 4.4,5,6. 1 *Cor.* 8. 5,6. So in the *Revelations* likewiſe, St. *John* makes the Son and Holy Ghoſt, but as Attendants on the Throne of the Father, *Rev.*5.6,7,8,*&c.* whilſt he only ſits on the Throne; and the greateſt Honour even of the Son is, that he has redeemed us, and ſo is become worthy to open the Book.

But yet as I have formerly ſhewn you, as the Father impowers the Holy Ghoſt through the Son, in all Acts of Grace, ſo are their Records One, 1 *John* 5. 7. and yet not but that this Record receives a ſtile agreeable to the Excellency of the Perſon giving it, where 'tis diſtinguiſh'd: Thus in the Father 'tis call'd Operation, the Son Adminiſtration, and in the Holy Ghoſt Gifts, 1 *Cor.*12.4,5,6. And the manner of Gift in the Father is called Love, in the Son Grace, and the Holy Ghoſt Fellowſhip, 2 *Cor.* 13. 14. *Rom.*15.16.

So likewiſe, as all Three being engaged in our Salvation, they are put in as Articles to our Apoſtles Creed, but yet with ſubordinate Titles, as God, Lord, and Holy, to ſhew their diſtinction and inferiority; ſo that your Argument you ſee, Sir, that their being there, makes them Coequal and God, is very weak, *page* 197. for by the ſame Reaſon you might make every Body, or the Catholick Church, God likewiſe.

Hence likewiſe, the ancient Doxology before it was alter'd, was, *Glory be to the Father, through the Son, and by the Holy Ghoſt*; that is, through the Son as Mediator, and by the Holy Ghoſt as a Miniſtring Aſſiſtant: (ſee *Sparks* on the Liturgy) which ſhew'd plainly their Subordination: Indeed ſince, upon the prevailing of the Doctrine of the Trinity, it has been alter'd: But with what Scripture Authority? now I hope you ſee plainly.

But I ſhall not diſſent from you, that the *Socinians* abſurdly baptize in the Name of the Holy Ghoſt, if there were none; and they do worſe than thoſe Diſciples who never heard of him, for they acknowledg'd him when they did, which theſe, even now, do not: But what, are not they our Brethren? And are we not bound to have a Charity for their Errour? And who ſhall condemn them in it, that they are wilfully blind.

However, to return: This makes not but that we are baptiz'd in their Names as our Spiritual Governours, *Matth.*28.19. for ſo even the Scriptures plainly expreſs themſelves, 1 *Cor.*12.13,27.---10.2. where we are told, That we are baptiz'd by one Spirit into one Body, which is Chriſt: that is, into the Church, by his Miniſter, whereof he is the Head, to the Worſhip, Honour, and Glory of God: And what,

Sir,

Sir, will you interpret againſt Scripture?

And this conſider'd, where ſtands any room from your Calumnies, *pag.* 27, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214. Is not the whole Foundation of your Argument rotten? Does Baptiſm ſhew Worſhip? And if not, how can it be an open and bareface'd Idolatry? What may not there be a Ceremony in it, to ſhew us, who under God are our Spiritual Governours, as well as by Water to imitate the cleanſing of Regeneration? If ſo, why may not my Conſtruction of it, agreeable to Scripture Interpretation, be as good as yours? I proteſt before God, did not my Hypotheſis not only want Abſurdity, but ſuit moſt rationally, yea moſt naturally to Truth and the Scriptures, I would ſooner dye than adhere to it.

Laſtly, Sir, to put your Union in your Hypotheſis beyond all doubt, the Scriptures have plainly ſhewn us, that theſe Three Perſons have various and diſtinct Intellectual Powers, *John* 16. 13, 14, 15, 16. *Mark* 13. 32. *John* 12. 49. And indeed, we might rationally have collected as much from their being given and ſent, did not our Myſteries quite ſhut our Eyes againſt Reaſon; but Men being once thus blinded, they think it enough if they can but pelt us with wreſted ſcraps of Scripture, without ſo much as looking for a Rational and General Coherence.

Of the FATHER.

Nor do the Scriptures cited of the Son, and Three Perſons, only agree to ſtrengthen our Hypotheſis, and deſtroy yours, but even thoſe that relate to the Father and Holy Ghoſt likewiſe; I ſhall give you ſhort Specimens of both, beginning with the firſt firſt, and then proceeding to the other, and after that, I ſhall conclude my Scripture Proofs in this, and proceed.

Know then that the Scriptures plainly tell us that the Father is the One, *Exod.* 20.2,3. *Deut.* 6.4. *Mark* 12. 29. *to* 34. only true God, *John* 8.54. 1 *Tim.* 2.5. 1 *Cor.* 8.4,5,6. *John* 17.3. only Good, *Luke* 18. 19. *Matth.* 19.17. only Wiſe, *Rom.* 16.27. 1 *Tim.* 1. 17. greater than the Son, *John* 14.28.---10.29. only ſitting on the Throne, the Son and Holy Ghoſt being as his Attendants, *Rev.* 4. 2---5,6,7. *Eſdr.* 2.42. *uſque* 48. and his Name is, *I am*, *Exod.* 3. 14, in oppoſition to α and ω, the Firſt and the Laſt; One ſignifying a pure and infinite Being, the other the firſt and great Creature, *Rev.* 3.14.

Further the Scriptures ſhew us, It is not agreeable with a due Reverence, that we ſhould confound the Titles of the Father with others; thus Chriſt gives us a particular charge, to remember not only that there is but One God, but that we have but one Father, and one Maſter, *Matth.* 23. 8,9. and St. *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 8. 4, 5, 6. tells us, That in Truth there it but One God, and One Lord; to wit, the Father, and his Son Chriſt Jeſus, according to *Phil.* 2. 11.

So they ſay, The Father is the Supream Lord of all, 1 *Cor.* 3. 22, 23. and greater than the Son, *John* 10.29.—14.28—17.24. and really his God too, *Eph.* 1. 3, 17. *Rev.* 3. 12. *John* 20. 17. and that he is the Fountain of Grace, *John* 6. 44, 65. and only inviſible, *John* 1.18. 1 *Tim.* 17.—6.16. *Acts* 2.2, 3. whereas the Son and Holy Ghoſt have been often ſeen, ſo he is only reveal'd by the Son, *John* 1.18. —3.35. *Mark* 11.27. *Luke* 10.22.

But what need I repeat more of theſe Proofs? The Scriptures are full of them, and were not Men blinded as they are, with the Epicicles of their Two Natures in Chriſt, and Mediatory Offices, *&c.* whereby they beg the thing in diſpute, and anticipate all Proofs, they would ſee the

Sun

Sun is not clearer than the Proofs I have given them; hereafter, I believe Men will admire at our blindneſs, as much as we do at the Papiſts now; but I ſee the Hand of God is upon us, we are curſed to it, and only Prayers can remove it.

Of the Holy Ghoſt.

I come now to ſpeak of the Holy Ghoſt, to ſhew you how much in every Point your Hypotheſis ſtraggles, and how you diſſent from Scripture in every ſtep you have made in your Myſtery; while the *Arrian* anſwers it, may I ſay to the moſt exact Truth, and keeps a due mean between your coequal Gods, and the *Socinians* no leſs abſurd meer Man, and power of God.

Know then, the Holy Ghoſt, the Spirit of Truth, *John* 14.17.—15.26. 1 *John* 4. 6. called ſo in oppoſition to Satan the lying Spirit, is a great God or Principality, and Chriſt's Univerſal Deputy, *Acts* 1. 2. —2.33. *Luke* 24.49. 1 *Cor.* 12.13. *Eph.* 4. 11. and as ſo the Giver of all good Gifts. 1 *Cor.*12. *Iſa.*11.2. *Rom.*5.5.—15.13. *Acts* 1. 8. —20. 28. *Luke* 12. 12. 1 *Cor.* 2. 10. 12.

Yet ſo, as he is ſubject to the Son, and receives his Authority from him, *John* 16. 12, 13, 14, 15. —15. 26. *Rev.* 5. 6. *Matth.* 3. 11. and thence, I believe it peremptory to blaſpheme his Evidence, *Matth.*12.31. *Mark* 3.28. *Luke* 12. 10. for to lie to him is to lie to God, *Acts* 5. 3, 4. that is, through him, though he be but in reality an Angel, *Rev.*22.16.—3.11. compar'd to *Act.*22.34. *Luke* 3.21,22. where he made the like Viſions; and indeed Blaſphemy againſt him otherwiſe were abſurd; it ſhould rather be againſt the Father and Son, eſpecially the Father, as *Fons Deitatis*, and whom the Jews reverenc'd when they knew not the Holy Ghoſt.

Further, As God made the Son his Inſtrument in the Angelical Creation, ſo he ſub-deputed the Holy Ghoſt in the Formation of Man, *Job* 33. 4. and of the Earth, *Gen.*1.2. *Job* 26.13. *Pſal.* 104. 30. and upon this account the Spirit is called Eminenter, the Spirit of God; that is, the greateſt next to God the Father, and the Lord Chriſt, and the moſt extraordinary Gift of God in his aſſiſtance, *Nehem.*9.20. *Rom.*8.26,27.

But yet he is ſo abſolutely Chriſt's Deputy, and ſent by the Son from the Father, *John* 14.16,17,26.—15. 26. *Eph.* 1. 13. that till Chriſt went he could not come, *John* 16.7,13,14.—7.39.—14. 12. and yet 'tis he that under Chriſt beſtows all variety of Spiritual Gifts, 1 *Cor.*12. that dwells in us, 1 *Cor.*6.19. 2 *Cor.*1.22. that ſpake by the Prophets, *Acts* 28. 25. *Luke* 2.25,26. that helps our Prayers, *Rom.*8.26, 27. 1 *Theſſ.*5.19. and indeed, that aſſiſts our ordinary Diſcourſe, *Mark* 13. 11. *Luke* 12.12. by his Grace, or holy Anointing, 1 *John* 2.27.

But to ſhut up all, he is in no place of the whole Scripture, either directly called God, or order'd to be worſhip'd; which laſt thing you are ſo modeſt as to grant, *page* 194, 195. ſo that upon the whole matter, to Idea him in coequality to the Father, as you ſee were ſo plain a violence to the Scripture, he not having ſo much Honour allow'd him, as even the Son has, that I declare, I admire it.

And by this time, I hope, Sir, you ſee plainly, that your reaſonings about the Holy Ghoſt, *page* 179, 193. are meer ſhuffles, and that your Texts, 1 *Cor.* 2.10. quoted by you, *page* 53. That *the Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea the deep things of God*, has no other ſence, than that the Holy Ghoſt co-operating with our Spirit, reveals us the greateſt knowledge we attain,

and

and that is what agrees with the Context, and the Text you cite in the next Page; but if it does with your Hypotheſis, I am miſtaken.

As for your other Reaſons, *page* 54, 55. and 64,65. brought to prove the Self-conſciouſneſs of the Father and Holy Ghoſt, they are as groundleſs as the reſt of your Myſtery, and therefore I ſhall only ſhew you I take notice of them; indeed, if the Holy Ghoſt knew all things thus of himſelf, what needed the Son ſhew them him.

And now, Sir, I hope by this time I have given you as ample ſatisfaction in your Scripture-proof, as you can deſire, you cannot but be ſo ingenious as to grant, that you have had all the advantages that a Succeſſion of Commentators can give you; whereas I you ſee, for all that, can heap you up the whole courſe of Scripture againſt you, that have not ſo much as one *Arrian* Author to aſſiſt me.

I have already inform'd you, what turn'd me to be an *Arrian*, and now I ſhall add, that when I had once reſolv'd, nothing ſhould be dearer to me than Truth, and bethought me the Corruption even of Primitive Tradition, and ſaw a neceſſity of ſticking wholly to the Scripture, the Sun was not clearer to me than the Doctrine which you call Heretical, and *Arrianiſm*.

And give me leave to tell you, thô you have Popularity and the Temporal Sword on your ſide, yet blaſpheme it more if you dare; if there be ſuch a thing as blaſphemy againſt the Holy Ghoſt, as we have Chriſt's word there is, to your peril be it Sir: I tell you, 'tis to blaſpheme the known Evidences of his Truth: and if theſe be ſuch, I dare venture my Truths with the Sword of the Spirit, againſt all your carnal Weapons.

Remember Sir, there is a Sin unto Death, we may not ſo much as pray for, 1 *John* 5. 16. and all our pretences and good Works will be of none effect, while we blaſpheme the moſt great and ſincere Truths of God; beware Sir of this great and fiery Tryal; I mean perverſly to blaſpheme God's Truths, eſpecially when ſo conſiderable as this, this is that that will make the Tree good, and the Fruit good, and the Tree evil, or its Fruit evil; indeed, can you expect to be call'd or receiv'd as a Son, when you openly and malitiouſly proclaim your ſelf a Rebel to the only and great means of Government of the Holy Ghoſt.

TRADITION.

Having now done with the Two firſt Heads of my Diſcourſe, the proof of the Trinity by Reaſon and Scripture, I proceed to the laſt, *viz.* Tradition, wherein would Men but be content to believe as they pray, I ſhould be ſatisfied; for that they do almoſt wholly to the Father; and therein may I ſay, they give all their pretences to Tradition the greateſt Lye even the Cauſe is capable of bearing; but alas, the World is made too giddy by this Myſtery, to bear ſuch, or any other Reaſoning.

Beſides, you bring Tradition as on your ſide, when at the ſame time all your Quotations for it, about the Trinity, contradict one another, *page* 107, 113, 119, *&c.* A very fair Tradition indeed, when after all you are forc'd to hammer out the Myſtery your ſelf.

So you bring a Tradition that deſtroys the firſt Commandment; and indeed, were it not for that, I would ſay, I believed the two Hypotheſis ſtarted fair together in the nice Cavils of *Arius* and *Alexander*

lexander ; But what ſhall I not now claim Tradition on my ſide, when I only ſeek for Liberty and the Firſt Commandment's againſt you. But to return :

I know Sir, you are very confident that ſhe is of your ſide, as you ſay, *page* 31. but your Proofs and Suggeſtions for it are as few and inconſiderable as even I can wiſh for, *page* 40. Thus you would fain wheedle us, that Men were *Arrians*, and not *Arrians*. And what Sir, was it out of Charity that they forbore to call the *Trinitarians* Hereticks ? If it was, 'twas a ſign they were the better Chriſtians for it, not that their Cauſe was the worſe.

So you aſperſe the Great Council of *Ariminum*, of 550 Biſhops, of ſo ſeeming or wou'd-be an Imputation, *page* 43, that I am aſham'd to ſee't : What Sir, do you think they would have called the greateſt Council that ever was, if they had deſign'd a tricking ? Or are you reſolv'd to truſt more to the Council of *Nice*, becauſe not ſo many ? Methinks Sir, you ſhould think it enough at leaſt, that your Tradition was diſputable then, that you had ſuch Numbers againſt you, and not repoſe on forging *Rome* for blemiſhing Councils.

You tell us, Mr. *Bull* has anſwer'd this matter throughly, *p.* 24. But I tell you Sir, I have perus'd him, and he has not ; and were it worth my while, I would ſhew it you too : beſides Sir, would you expect a fair and ſtrict Combate, after ſo many Years, while *Rome* has held the ſtakes ? What wont you make us no allowance in your Thoughts ? Not that we beg it neither : But is it generous, firſt to fetter a Man, and then challenge him ? What ſhall I ſay ? Is this the way to defend your Catholick Faith ! That Faith which you ſay requires both Forehead and Forgery to deny it, *page* 44. when you ſhould ſay to maintain It ?

Give me leave to adviſe you a little Sir, if you are reſolv'd to follow Tradition : Be not partial in it : Why ſhould you act by halves ? you would be a good Papiſt, and might deſerve a Cardinal's Cap, were you ſincere, and follow'd it throughout : Or if as a Proteſtant you hate this courſe, why do you not purſue it more home, and to the root ?

Tradition was only of uſe till the Scriptures were deliver'd ; and indeed 'tis well if 'twas contain'd pure till then ; as we may moſt juſtly cenſure, by St. *John's* Advice to the Churches, in the *Revelations*. But to continue Tradition further, what is it, but like the *Jews*, to make the Law of God of none effect, by our Traditions.

You muſt excuſe me therefore, if I think Tradition to be too much a Noſe of Wax, to be alledg'd againſt Scripture ; eſpecially ſuch expreſs apparent and ſelf-evident Texts, at *Heb.* 1. and *John* 16. I ſhall therefore leave you to jangle out your quoted Inconſiſtencies, *page* 107, 108, 113, 114, 119, 120, 121. And tell you withal, ſuch Variances are no Miracle in a Traditionary Myſtery.

In ſhort Sir, if ever you deſign for Truth, you muſt learn a new bravery, to be able to dare to be ſingular, think you that Men that geld, ſuppreſs, and forge Books are in the right, or they that perſecute all that oppoſe them ? Surely, I hope you think better, that theſe are the Engines of weaker Error ; and yet this is even the preſent Caſe ; and who dares even at this day, and in full Proteſtancy, to write or ſpeak freely, he is ſure of being ſuppreſſed at beſt.

Dam-

Damnatory Sentence.

But before I leave this Subject, there is another part of your Diſcourſe that deſerves to be conſider'd; and that is, your Damnatory Sentence, wherein I wiſh I could ſpare you; but your love for your Myſtery, has ſo inſpir'd you, with ſuch a furious and unchriſtian Zeal, that 'twould be an Offence to the World, ſhould I leave it unanſwer'd under ſo great a Name. Thus,

P. 22, you ſay, this *Faith is neceſſary to Salvation*: and *p.* 23. That *no Jew, Turk or Pagan can be ſav'd without it.* And that, *whether he has us'd reaſonable diligence or not*: Or, *whether it has been perplext with never ſo great Controverſies.* The ſame you add, *page* 271, only you add this merciful Apology, *That Men may underſtand it, if they will.*

And further, that I may give your Argument the greateſt force, you add, *p.* 25, That *to ſay Men can be ſav'd by good Works alone, without Faith, is Popery*: And *page* 26. That *if Salvation were ſo common, Chriſtianity were but a better Sect of Philoſophy*; and *there would be too great a ſcope for Infidelity*, page 23.

Alas Sir, I pity you; had you regarded Natural Religion more, and your Myſtery leſs, you would not have abounded with ſuch an Envy and Monopoly of Salvation: What muſt we have no Faith, but be ſav'd by Works, becauſe we have not juſt this Myſtery? And what is it nothing to Chriſtianity, that we have ſeveral degrees of Glory as an Encouragement, ſet in our proſpect and ſearch above the Heathen? Or what Sir, is your Eye evil, becauſe God is good? Would you have God a Devil, create Men meerly for Damnation? Or would you have him damn them to ſupport your Hypotheſis?

See how your Myſtery has miſled you, Sir, that Men ſhould be ſav'd, only by parroting over a few unintelligible words: I might have expected this from ſome ignorant Sectariſt, but I never thought a skilful Doctor ſhould make God ſo hard a Task-maſter, as to require Men to believe ſo penally, what 'tis plain, not One in a Million underſtands: Alas Sir, you miſtake the Redemption of Chriſt; 'twas to purchaſe us a new Covenant, and not only teach us a new Faith.

On *Adam*'s Fall we chang'd our State, our Tryal by a ſingle Precept, for the Law of Nature, but had not the Seed of the Woman begun even then to have broke the Serpent's Head, at leaſt through a Covenant to be fulfill'd: Can you blaſpheme God, ſo as to ſay, he would let him be fruitful? Will not a Prophet be able to vindicate his Juſtice, that has declar'd long ſince, every Man, and he alone ſhould bear his own iniquity.

I ſay, then Chriſt has purchaſed us a new Covenant, and ſince he is come, there is ſome reaſon for us to honour him with the neceſſity of our Faith through him, to lead us to Salvation, and to obey his excellent Precepts, to conduct us through the Second Covenant, the Law of Nature, to Perfection; But where could be the neceſſity of this before?

I ſee Sir, your Virtues have no Extreams, you have Faith, but allow no Credulity; if you did, you could never ſwallow theſe things; you confirm the old Sentence, *Credo quia impoſſibile eſt*: But alas Sir, do you think to make your Doctrine prevail by theſe means, by a dead anathematizing implicite Faith, fitter for Paganiſm than Chriſtianity.

No, your Uncharitableneſs cannot but blemiſh you, even among your own Friends; indeed the Predeſtinarian does not exceed this; and may be, Men ſee-

ing thus, how one Errour leads you into another ſo black, will be brought by it to ſee the Truth they conſider'd not before.

Beſides Sir, had you conſulted Scripture in this, the Apoſtle tells you plainly, that Chriſt died for the ſins of the whole world, *1 John* 2.1,2. And if not, think you God's Mercy would have detain'd him till the latter Ages of the World: Beſides Sir, are we not charg'd not to judge them that are without; and are we not told, that where there is no Law, there is no Sin, *John* 9.41. *James* 4.17. and that they that have not been able to receive a Law, or Revelation, are to be tried by Natural Religion, and their Conſcience, as a Law within themſelves, *Rom. cap.* 1. & 2. And indeed, which is the Law improv'd by Chriſt himſelf, and which is written in our Heart, according to the Apoſtle to the *Hebrews* 8.10.

Alas, Sir, had you judg'd of the wilfully ignorant and perverſe, you had left ſome colour for your Cenſure to be true, and yet even then, were I in your caſe, I ſhould be very unwilling to fling the firſt Stone, eſpecially ſince Chriſt has told us, as we judge we ſhall be judged; I had rather let Men be guilty, and God condemn them, then condemn my ſelf by judging them; but more eſpecially in our caſe, for you miſtake, Sir, 'is not the Catholick Faith, but the *Athanaſian* Fancies we contend with.

Take care therefore, Sir, and be not offended with this ancient Truth; let not our Fathers Guilt deſcend upon you, the Guilt will be the Guilt of that Age, not of this, unleſs you juſtifie the Enforcement *de novo*, and methinks, Sir, you ſhould not ſtruggle for greater Vindications, for methinks you have wrote already as much as the Cauſe can bear.

But methinks I hear you object to me, What Faith is neceſſary then, if this be not? I ſay, the Faith of *Enoch*, *Abraham*, and *Moſes*, that God is a Rewarder of the Juſt in tender Conſciences, is enough, and that without *Idolizing Works*, as you reflect *page* 25. I add alſo, that a particular Faith of Mercy through Chriſt is neceſſary, where offer'd with Conviction; but whatever you do or ſay, God will never require Conſent, where he has not given Evidence enough; and what is it to me, if it can be had in a Cauſe if I cannot come at it.

To theſe may be alſo added by conſent the Apoſtles Creed, or any other, ſo it be not enforc'd; but for your nice and ſpeculative Creeds, they are unneceſſary, or elſe you accuſe Chriſt and his Apoſtles, of a cowardly lukewarmneſs for omitting them, for all you inſinuate, *page* 29. that we would be at Creed-making too, Sir; but we beg your pardon, and have more Charity; for if we explain our Hypotheſis, 'tis only to confute yours.

Conſider therefore, Sir, by your own Reaſoning, 'tis Popery to *judge of the Catholick Church by its multitude*, page 36. ſo remember 'tis our Heat magnifies our Zeal in this Hypotheſis above others; for any other explain'd as nicely, would have as bad effects; and give me leave to retort your Argument: *Tho' I am modeſt, yet you have given me occaſion to oppoſe you as Popular; and tho' I am cautious, yet Truth bids me not fear, whether your Myſtery prove true, but warn you, that under protection of a Myſtery, you do not oppugn Truth*, Vide page 44. What, Sir, have I not as much Reaſon to be ſingular from you, as you from the *Eaſtern*, the *Greek*, and *Latin* Churches.

To conclude, in Charity I ſhall give you one Advice more; and that is, that you do not at every turn, like the Papiſts, Cap Hereticks,

Hereticks, and repeat Catalogues of Heresies, as you are apt to do, *page* 107. You are a Protestant, Sir, and you should rather lament, that Church-Impositions so long took away an innocent liberty of Opinion from the World, and by an immoderate Self-love of impos'd Opinions and Disciplines, rent the Bond of Peace and Unity in sunder.

CONCLUSION.

I hope, Sir, by this time you see that we *Unitarians* do *understand what we write of*; for all what you charge us with, *page* 4. nay, and more, I'le add: We do it without mazing Metaphysicks to help us; indeed, we have not your Breath of the Populace, to encourage us into large and fair Volumes; but I hope we have Truth far better to recommend us to the sincere.

I hope, Sir, too, you see we do not *arrogate Infinite Knowledge*, as you asperse us, *page* 5. but vindicate a Truth clear as the day: Indeed, 'tis plain, the first Commandment, except to exclude Persons, is Nonsense; and who in this Case must bear the Reflection, you, or God; surely we must acquit God; and if we do, our Faith must fling you into all the Absurdities and Contradictions of Transubstantiation. The Case is not, whether in Idea there may not be Three Self-conscious, co-equal Beings, but whether an Interpreter of the first Commandment can justifie such a thing: And that I am sure he cannot, for all your struggles after Vindications, without Absurdity and Nonsense.

So that you not only made God a liar, by your Hypothesis, but you destroy that truth, the Unity of the Godhead by it, a Truth your self grants the Foundation of Natural Religion: What is God but One? and is it impossible to make him more, but by many Persons? And what? for all that can we yet make him many Persons, and yet not make him more than One? This is a Fetch indeed, but fitter for a Quibler in the Schools, than ever to be thought a Truth by a sincere Divine.

But you say perchance, that this Commandment was only given for the grosser Idolatries of the Heathen: Was it so; But then why was the Second given us, that forbids us the Worshipping Stocks and Stones, and Creatures? What, I warrant, the first was only a little Tautology; you say well Friend, because God himself wrote it.

But you'l say, here is some colour for the Trinity: And what, is there not then as much for Transubstantiation? This is plain, our Bodies are not two years together the same, and thô differing thus twenty times in our Lives, we call it still the same Body: May not we on this then as justly salve Transubstantiation, that the Spirit of Christ is able to dwell in infinite Bodies at once; and will not this make as properly the same Body, as my Body at twenty, is my Body at thirty. But you answer, You have Scripture of your side; and pray shew me half so strong a Chapter for the Trinity, as *John* the sixth is for Transubstantiation: Or if you say that that Chapter relates not to the Sacrament, you contradict almost all the Sacramental Books of Devotion that are yet extant about it.

But suppose it does not, think you our Cause is lost for that? No Sir, I dare give the World a Challenge, That even upon the common ordinary Texts, and the general Reason of the Doctrine of the Trinity, I will amply prove, That it is, may I say, doubly, more inconsistent and

inexplicable than Tranſubſtantiation; and he that dares ſtand this Challenge, let him but get me ingeniouſly a free liberty of Writing, and I'll truſt my Reputation whether I can do it or no.

Alas Sir, you ſee your Fallacies do but divert your Cauſes being expos'd for a time, till a nice Refutation makes it look the blacker for its Sophiſtry: And now you may ſee who 'tis that brings down the plain Scriptures, to be wreſted by the abſurd Reaſon of a Myſtery, *page* 141. And now Men and Angels may ſee, who are thoſe *abſurd and ſenſleſs Infidels, that reject what they have Evidence for*, v. page 6. In ſhort, I dare appeal to all the World, tho' againſt me, whether Suppreſſion of Books be not your beſt Argument.

You tell us, *page* 148. That *our Buſineſs is, to prove Three Perſons Three Gods:* And we do it by this, That if God be more than One Perſon, when not particularly reveal'd, and contrary to his firſt Commandment, his Commandment is of no effect: But ſhall we grant that? No, we'll turn the havock of the firſt Commandment juſtly, in Contradictions upon you; we need not ask with *Nicodemus*, *How can theſe things be?* page 150. but we'll tell you, with the ſame reaſon, we may make three thouſand Gods, that you believe a Lye, *Theſſ.* 2. 11. And you had as good make all Mankind One Man, and deſtroy all Plurality and Numbers, *&c.* But for Peace-ſake, I ſhall forbear further Reflections, *page* 109.

And hence, ſhould you invent a thouſand Metaphyſick ſtrains more, this one plain Truth would ruin them all; indeed, did not Myſtery, the Authority of the Whore, *Rev* 17. and the great ſupport of Popery, bear up your Hypotheſis, her Epitaph might have been wrote, I doubt not, many hundred years ago.

Myſtery do I ſay, Myſtery and Perſecution are the Devil's Twins, and ſtand and fall both together; Perſecution without Myſtery were too cruel, and Myſtery without Blood too much Nonſence to be born: 'Tis theſe two are Popery, and the worſt of Popery; Tranſubſtantiation without theſe were an innocent Error: And what, are not Proteſtants aſham'd to weild the Sword of Antichriſt? Yes ſurely; but if they are, why do they ſtifle us, and our Books, is it not that they fear our Truths?

If any little trifling Sect or Hereſie ſpawn among you, you can bear it with intolerable patience, and as long as you can diſcern a blind ſide in Sects, you have no regard for the ſcratches of their Pens; but if Truth aſſault you under the Nickname of an Hereſie, you rave as if you were ſtung by a *Taratantula*.

Thus, to the immortal glory of the Reformation one of the laſt Hereticks that was burnt here, was a poor Woman for being an *Arrian*; But alas, did not our Burners deſtroy Truths, and not Hereſies, why ſhould they ſneek from Argument, as they do, when they have whole Univerſities to ſupport them.

But to return, Sir; Are you not aſham'd to rail at us for Blaſphemers and Hereticks as you do; if I am not miſtaken, we mean as ſincerely, and interpret the Scripture as well as you, for all your Boaſts, *p.* 141. and you ſhall find, God in the Great Day will ſhew which is the Heretick. What, have we not as much reaſon to complain of the blemiſhes of the firſt and great Commandment, as you have of your Trinity; and cannot the Controverſie of *Eliſha* and *Baal*, remember you, that 'tis not Numbers, but Minds that God ſeeks.

But you ſay, this is a Myſtery: And pray, who has authoris'd it for one? You bely God in his Scriptures, if you ſay that he

he has; no, 'tis Man's own invention, and that 'tis that makes him idolize the uncharitable imposition so much: What, shall God bid us publish what none shall understand? Pray, who can agree in this Mystery? Or were the Copy of it lost, who would be able exactly to hammer it out? Is this clear like a heavenly Truth?

Are we not asham'd to continue this stumbling block in Christianity, that has so justly offended all Jews, Turks, and Pagans it ever came near; indeed, does not *Mahomet* support his division by this very thing, and does he not complain above an hundred times against the abuse of the Unity in his Alchoran? And indeed, do we not support Popery her self, by supporting all her most perniciousArguments about it.

What shall I say, if we repent not this Error, shall we not justly stand branded to all Posterity, a Race of pretended Protestants, but really a Philosophical Sect of Christian Atheists. Besides, what but the Corruption of this Unity in the Godhead, can have so long prosper'd the *Mahometan* above the *Christian*, and the *Papists* above the *Protestants*. I'le warrant you, the Papists will groan when they once see us thus, by an Apostolick charitable Liberty, go about to unite our selves, and so of course confound them.

To be short Reader, excuse me that I am thus rough with thee, which I should never have been, had the Enemies of mine Hypothesis shewn me the least Candor or Ingenuity; but when a corrupt Generation of Men shall think to stifle my Cause without hearing, excuse me that I write even bitter rather than fail, to command thine attention. I expect that some of them will at last be provoked to give me an Answer, but if they do, 'twill only be to confuse the Cause to run giddy, and gaping over Substance, strain at some little Straws, to rave against that Grand Arch-Heretick *Arrius*, as I find is too commonly done, and not think of the Truth.

Thus I am a Mad-man they say too; But why? Because I fear God, and not Man, and dare tell a perverse People of their Faults, and scorn an easie Security, when preferr'd to the Glory of God; or else I would dare put it to the Test,which Hypothesis savours most of Madness, the *Arrian*, or the *Athanasian*. Indeed to be singular to the World, is as good as to be mad: But what, shall I regard that, as long as I follow Truth? No, thô I stand alone, One among Ten thousand millions, I dare trust God so far as to be singular for his sake.

Good God! that Protestants, that with all meekness and sincerity should hear their Duty, and that by their Profession should seem to be reform'd, that they, I say, should be as perverse as Papists, that Arguments should be flung away on them, and that the Holy Ghost should have no way left even to inform them, that Church Authority, and Implicite Faith and Mystery should take root anew among us, and that to establish as great Absurdities as we left in *Rome*.

Good God! that we who pretend to Purity, should thus harden our selves against all Conversion, that Truth should lose all her Charms with us, and Reasoning be flung away upon us, that Errors, thô as gross as that Snow is black, should pass muster among us.

That our Charity should lie bleeding, and our little Niceties among us should render Catholick Communion impossible, that those Men that strive to cement and heal these breaches, should be hiss'd at and discourag'd amongst us: Good God! is this like thy Church! Or are we not rather

rather become a Den of Thieves !

And yet I'll warrant you, they'd fain be flatter'd on, and would needs ſtill be perſwaded of their Orthodoxy ; But who ſhall do it ? Shall I ? No, their perverſeneſs almoſt makes me hate Mankind; and were it not for the ſake of my Duty to God, and my Love to thoſe few Perſons that are good, I ſhould even abhor to live amongſt them, and would wiſh an eaſie Martyrdom, that I might be rid of them, and leave ſuch a Generation of Vipers behind me. But to return :

I ſhall add no more at preſent, but that were this Myſtery the greateſt Truth, yet conſidering Mens weakneſs, 'twere both hateful and ſeditious, to impoſe it on one another, in pain of Salvation; to ſubſcribe it only as an Article of Peace, in ſome caſes might be tolerable ; but to force Mens Conſciences to they know not what themſelves, is in plain terms Antichriſtian, Uncharitable, and Deviliſh.

And alas ! now we ſee wherein our Reformation is imperfect, that it has not preſerv'd our eternal liberty of Opinion, in things not expreſly reveal'd ; this is the Root of all Controverſie, and this muſt be cur'd, if ever we hope for Peace : Indeed, in a free Remonſtrancy, where all Impoſitions are cut off, Hereſies of courſe pine and die with their Authors, for want of room to be regarded.

And now, Sirs, let me ſee your bravery in juſtifying a ſtifled Truth we Martyr to Pride, when we only follow Religion becauſe in faſhion, whereas true a Conſcience dares follow a Truth that is ſingular; where then are your Caſuiſts that can ſolve theſe Doubts ? What, is there none ? If there be any honeſt Men among you then, turn for ſhame, and reſcue the polluted honour of God ; What, are we pure Chriſtians, when the worſt of Popery is behind ?

And now Sir, I ſhall more particularly addreſs my ſtile to your ſelf : And in the firſt place I beg you to pardon all my Reprehenſions, and if they are any where bitterer than they ought, reckon it my frailty, not my injuſtice, and at leaſt you ought to thank me for my good intention ; but if you approve what I have wrote, return God the Glory for your information, and I am ſatisfied.

I aſſure you Sir, in my ſelf I am griev'd to write againſt a good Man ; nor would I, but that my love to God and Truth commands me ; nor do I write this, that I think you want either Piety or Ability, indeed you ſhine for both in your Church ; but I would adviſe you, that you have miſtook the Truth ; not wonder at it, for the greateſt Fathers in the Church have done it before you.

You have ventur'd to be ſingular once in Conſcience already, and your Treatiſe of *Death* ſhews you ſincere ; dare once a deeper Reſignation, and a more ſingular Truth, if you fall not back, you know not what Service God may have for you to do. Remember Sir, 'tis Conſtancy to follow Truth in all changes of Notions, and but Obſtinacy to remain ſtiff after Conviction.

Beſides, 'twill be as much your Glory as St. *Auſtin*'s, that you recant ; and if you are a Chriſtian indeed, you cannot hate your Friend, or Glaſs for ſhewing you your wrinkles, nor will your ſingularity be worſe, if you ſee them ; unleſs in Piety, that others are as bad, or worſe than your ſelf, and dare not ſee it.

And what thô I am ſingular and contemptible, my Truths, if ſincere, are Divine, and St. *Paul* as well as you, had both Zeal and Popularity, and yet was in an Error ; if you are in an Error, pray God open your Eyes ; and if I am, I beg him to grant me to be rectified by your Inſtruction ; 'twill be hard if a Miracle

cle be neceſſary to inſtruct and reconcile us.

But I cannot perſwade my ſelf, that you will continue to pervert this grand Truth, and by Reflections and Niceties endeavour further to obſcure and cloud it; what you have hitherto done, I hope, nay believe you have done ignorantly, and becauſe the *Socinian* Hypotheſis was not ſincere enough, you oppos'd it; but for the *Arrian*, I almoſt dare promiſe my ſelf more Charity from you, if not Conviction.

At firſt I declin'd this Book, as not thinking it proper to be wrote by an *Arrian*, and as fearing leaſt my own Reſentments might foyl the Honour of God; and I had done it ſtill, had not I had more than Humane Motives to the contrary; but whatever they were, they were to my ſelf; and my Reader's buſineſs is to mind my Truths, and not my Pretences.

To conclude, if Men are ſincere, I think I have wrote enough to convince them, and if perverſe to condemn them; and Charity engages me no further: But alas! what avails it, if God will not vindicate his own Honour, the Attempts of his Servans are otherwiſe in vain; and yet at leaſt I ſhall be content, thô at any hazard, when I have done my Duty.

All Glory to whom only due to the One and Only God, through His Great and Beloved Son Chriſt Jeſus.

☞ *Whoever Anſwers this, is deſir'd to make his Anſwer ſhort, that he run not the World into Labyrinths; and that he repeat the whole Body of the Diſcourſe* Verbatim, *that he may not juggle the World out of Subſtance, by ſnarling at Trifles: Theſe two Conditions anſwer'd, I think I ſhall have a Reply worth Reading; if not, I accuſe it beforehand to the World for a Cheat, and a Deceit not worth taking Notice of.*

The

The POSTSRIPT:
OR AN
Addition of ſome few PROPOSITIONS *to the* LETTER *before.*

I. FIrſt, Sir, if you do not think this Letter ſufficient to turn you *Arrian*, yet if you grant me, it has Evidence enough to perſwade you, that even your Impoſition is unreaſonable, that is enough for my purpoſe; and if you grant me that, I ſhall burn my Hypotheſis if you deſire it, for I require no more.

II. Secondly, If you once allow this to be a needleſs Impoſition, I am ſure you cannot deny, that 'tis become a Scandal alſo; for that muſt needs be of great Offence, that has afforded ſo many hundred years Objections as well from Jews, Turks, and Infidels, as from our Brethren of Chriſtianity.

III. If this be an Offence, and of a Conſequence ſo manifeſtly pernicious, pray tell me who ſhall excuſe every honeſt Man, much more every good Chriſtian of Reproving it, is it our Duty to tell our Brother of his fault, that he may repent, and ſhall we only neglect it in thoſe Offences that are conſiderable?

IV. Fourthly, If you give therefore ſuch Offence that an honeſt Man in Charity, and then ſurely a good Chriſtian in Conſcience is bound to reprove; and when you are rebuk'd, you will endeavour to deſtroy thoſe that admoniſh you: Pray conſider, what is it, Sir, in plain Engliſh, but that you cannot bear a good Chriſtian, nor an honeſt Man amongſt you.

5. Laſtly, Sir, It is not difficult to foretel, that if Men will ſtill continue luke-warm, and not correct theſe groſſer failings in their Reformation, I am perſwaded at laſt we ſhall ſcarce have a Chriſtian among us; but at leaſt our Gentry, like the *Rational Sceptick*, will lie all drown'd and loſt in Atheiſm and Infidelity, thinking even the very Deſign of Religion a Cheat.

If I receive that Encouragement in this, that might engage me to a further Eſſay of this Nature, I here promiſe the World, That as my Charity has forc'd me hitherto, ſo it ſhall not be wanting for a full Reformation, even of the whole Syſtem of Learning; I mean all the Fallacies of Reaſoning, and the Pedantries of Arts and Sciences, as well as the Corruptions of Morality and Religion, and by a compleat Rationale, to ſeparate the Subſtance from the Rubbiſh, throughout the whole Body of Wiſdom

The Infant is already form'd, it wants only the ſtrength of Favour to give it birth.

FINIS.